LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. ..... Copyright No. .....

Shelf BS1171
.P55

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

# THEOLOGY

OF THE

# OLD TESTAMENT

BY

CH. PIEPENBRING

PASTOR, AND PRESIDENT OF THE REFORMED CONSISTORY
AT STRASSBURG

*TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH, BY PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR, WITH ADDED REFERENCES FOR ENGLISH READERS*

BY

H. G. MITCHELL

PROFESSOR IN BOSTON UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
COPYRIGHT
JUN 7 1893
CITY OF WASHINGTON
48956

NEW YORK: 46 EAST 14TH STREET
THOMAS Y. CROWELL & COMPANY
BOSTON: 100 PURCHASE STREET

BS1171
.P55

Copyright, 1893,
By T. Y. CROWELL & CO.

Typography by J. S. Cushing & Co.
Presswork by S. J. Parkhill & Co.

# TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

The book of which this is a translation made its appearance in 1886. It seems to have at first attracted little attention even in Europe, owing probably to the fact that it was written in French and published in Paris. Schultz, who mentions a smaller work by Kayser of the same date, had evidently overlooked this one, when, in 1888, he issued the last edition of his *Theologie*. The book was first brought to the notice of Americans by the *Presbyterian Quarterly*, in 1888. The review of it then published was very favorable. In fact, the reviewer said of it: "On the whole, we regard it as the best Theology of the Old Testament that has yet been published."

In view of this estimate it seems strange that a translation was not at once undertaken. Perhaps the interest in Biblical Theology did not then warrant such an undertaking; or, perhaps, those who would naturally have encouraged it shared a wide-spread prejudice, according to which "no good thing" in theology can come from France. It must have been a trace of this prejudice that prevented me from becoming acquainted with the book. At any rate, I did not read it until a year ago, and when I finally took it in hand I did not expect much from its perusal. I was

therefore surprised to find that, though I could not accept all its statements, it grew upon me from the beginning. I was pleased with the style, its clearness and simplicity; but what especially attracted me was a frankness and fearlessness, the evident outgrowth of the faith of a sincere Christian. These characteristics are most apparent in the Conclusion, which, by the way, the reader will do well to read next, thus making it also a sort of introduction. This Conclusion so completely won my confidence, that, when I had read it, I immediately wrote to M. Piepenbring, asking him, if he had not already made other arrangements, to let me put the book into English. He readily assented, and I at once went to work upon the translation, convinced that a book written in such a spirit, even if it sometimes yielded more than was necessary, could not but further the cause of religion. I trust that many will find it very helpful in their attempts to adjust themselves to any new ideas that they may feel obliged to adopt.

The reader will doubtless be interested to know something personal about the author, although his biography sounds strangely (for a European's) like that of an American clergyman. He is a native of Alsace, having been born in Mittelbergheim, of that (formerly French, now German) province, in 1840. There he grew to manhood, receiving only the rudiments of an education at the schools of his native village. When he became a man, having chosen an industrial career, he went to Paris to seek his fortune. In that city he fortunately found himself surrounded by Christian influences, the result of which was the conviction

that he was called to the ministry. In obedience to this call he abandoned his former employment, and entered a preparatory school in Paris-Batignolles. There he took a degree in Arts, and thence he went to Strassburg to take a theological course. At the university he came in contact with several distinguished theologians, but the one who seems to have exerted most influence over him was the venerable critic Reuss, to whose works, as will be noticed, he constantly refers.

In 1871, when he was thirty-one years of age (late for a European), M. Piepenbring received the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, and left the University to become pastor of a small parish at Fonday, near Waldersbach, also in Alsace. Here he remained eight years, at the end of which period he was called to the position of French pastor of the Reformed parish in Strassburg. This position he still holds, as well as that of President of the Consistory to which he belongs.

Though actively engaged in the duties of a Christian minister, M. Piepenbring has found time to do no little literary work. He is a regular contributor to several periodicals. For the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (Paris), he has written a series of articles, chapters from a forthcoming History of Israel. He also has a Theology of the New Testament in preparation.

A word, in conclusion, respecting the translation. I have endeavored to confine myself to the functions of an interpreter. Now and then, however, I have been obliged to make slight changes or additions in order to adapt the book

to the needs or requirements of its new readers. Thus, in the notes, while, wherever a book cited was translated, I have simply given the English title with the corresponding page, etc., wherever there are references to books not yet translated, and only such, I have added references to English authorities such as I thought the author would naturally quote in the given cases.

The original has no indexes. I have prepared for the translation four, one of which contains all the passages cited in the *text* of the book. It did not seem worth while to include those in the notes.

Perhaps I ought to add for the benefit of any who may not be familiar with Hebrew, that in the Hebrew words that occur, the consonants are to be given their usual sounds, except in the following cases: *bh* is to be pronounced like *v*, *dh* like *th* in *this*, *kh* like the German *ch*, *ṣ* like a sharp *s*, and *q* not unlike a *k*.[1] The vowels should be pronounced after what is called the Continental method.

[1] In transliterating these words I have not followed the scheme of the author, but (substantially) the more common one of Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar.

# AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

We do not think that this publication needs a prolix justification. There are only two works in French that treat of this subject: the first part of Haag's *Théologie Biblique* and Oehler's *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament*, translated from the German by M. de Rougemont. But though these works both contain excellent features, they both also present *lacunæ*. They can be criticised especially as not showing, as completely and yet as succinctly as possible, the development of the religious thought and life of Israel, using the learned works of Germany as we intend to do. May this book contribute in some measure to a better knowledge of biblical truth in the churches that use the French language.

We must not forget to thank in this public manner Professor Kayser for the valuable hints which he has kindly given us, and of which we have made great use in the final elaboration of this work.[1]

[1] Since these lines were written Professor Kayser has been removed by death from the affectionate circle of his friends.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.


PAGE

PREFACE ..... iii

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

I. Method and plan ..... 1

II. Literature ..... 3

FIRST PERIOD.

§ 1. MOSAISM ..... 7

§ 2. ANCIENT PROPHETISM AND THE ART OF DIVINATION ..... 11

§ 3. THE IDEA OF GOD ..... 21

§ 4. THE COVENANT OF JEHOVAH WITH ISRAEL ..... 29

§ 5. ETHICAL LIFE ..... 34

§ 6. WORSHIP ..... 39

I. Places of worship ..... 39

II. The priesthood ..... 43

III. Religious festivals ..... 47

1. The Sabbath ..... 47

2. The new moon ..... 48

3. The three pilgrim feasts ..... 49

*a*. The feast of passover, and of unleavened bread 50

*b*. The feast of the harvest ..... 54

*c*. The feast of tabernacles ..... 55

IV. Religious rites ..... 57

1. Circumcision ..... 57

2. Sacrifices ..... 59

3. The offering of the first-born, first-fruits, and tithes 63

4. Prayer ..... 65

5. Vows ..... 66

6. The anathema ..... 67

7. The nazirate ..... 68

8. Fasting ..... 71

9. Purifications and Levitical purity ..... 73

## SECOND PERIOD.

PAGE

§ 7. Prophetism in its Purity ..... 81
§ 8. Unity and Spirituality of God ..... 91
I. Unity of God ..... 92
II. Spirituality of God ..... 96
§ 9. Names and Attributes of God ..... 99
I. Names of God ..... 99
1. Jehovah ..... 99
2. Jehovah, God of hosts ..... 103
3. The Holy One of Israel ..... 106
4. God, the Strong One, the Mighty One, the Most-High, the Lord ..... 111
II. Attributes of God ..... 114
1. Moral attributes ..... 114
2. Metaphysical attributes ..... 120
§ 10. Creation ..... 124
§ 11. Providence ..... 129
§ 12. The Manifestation of God in the World ..... 137
I. The glory, the name, the face, the *malakh* of God ..... 138
1. The glory of God ..... 138
2. The name of God ..... 141
3. The face of God ..... 143
4. The *malakh* of God ..... 144
II. Cherubim and Seraphim ..... 147
1. Cherubim ..... 147
2. Seraphim ..... 150
III. Angels ..... 153
IV. The spirit of God ..... 156
§ 13. The Nature of Man ..... 159
§ 14. The Dignity of Man ..... 167
§ 15. Faithfulness to Jehovah ..... 173
§ 16. Worship ..... 178
§ 17. Israel's Unfaithfulness and the Essence of Sin ..... 185
§ 18. The Extent of Sin ..... 189
§ 19. The Origin of Sin ..... 192
§ 20. The Guilt of Sin ..... 197
§ 21. The Day of Judgment ..... 201

PAGE

§ 22. Salvation ..... 207
I. The restoration of Israel under the new covenant .... 207
II. The participation of the gentiles in the new covenant. 212
§ 23. The Messiah ..... 217
§ 24. The Servant of Jehovah ..... 225
§ 25. Retribution and Theodicy ..... 233

THIRD PERIOD.

§ 26. Holy Scripture ..... 241
§ 27. The Doctrine of God ..... 247
§ 28. Angelology ..... 253
§ 29. Demonology ..... 256
§ 30. Death and the Future Life ..... 263
§ 31. Levitism ..... 276
I. The sanctuary ..... 280
II. The priesthood ..... 285
III. Religious festivals ..... 292
1. The sabbath ..... 292
2. The sabbatical year ..... 296
3. The year of jubilee ..... 298
4. The new moon ..... 299
5. The pilgrim feasts ..... 300
6. The day of atonement ..... 304
7. The feast of purim ..... 306
IV. Religious rites ..... 307
§ 32. Forgiveness and Atonement ..... 309
§ 33. Ethical Life ..... 316
I. Pharisaism ..... 316
II. Exclusivism ..... 320
III. Skepticism ..... 323
IV. Wisdom ..... 325
§ 34. The Apocalypse of Daniel ..... 331
Conclusion ..... 343
Indexes ..... 351

# INTRODUCTION.

## I. METHOD AND PLAN.

We shall follow the exegetical and historical method. It does not need to be vindicated. All modern theologians worthy of the name recognize its excellence. The dogmatic method, hitherto generally followed, is more and more neglected even by conservative theologians.

The majority of the works that treat our subject are divided into two principal parts: the first gives a *résumé*, more or less complete, of the history of the religion of Israel in general; the second discusses the religious ideas and practices, without taking account of their successive development. Other works present only a detailed historical discussion, divided into a large number of periods. The disadvantage of this last method is that it sacrifices the total effect to the details, necessitates numerous repetitions, and does not show the historical connection of the various topics treated. The other method is faulty in presenting only the history of the religion of Israel in general, and neglecting the historical development demonstrable in matters of detail. It will be best, we think, to leave to works that narrate the history of Israel the task of giving a general view of their religion, and confine our-

selves to showing, as far as possible, the historical development of each particular topic.

A number of works, that of Oehler, for example, confine themselves exclusively to the teaching of the canonical books. Others, like those of de Wette and von Cölln, include, in the theology of the Old Testament, the religious ideas that are found among the Jews at the beginning of the Christian era. As for us, we shall not confine ourselves to the canonical books alone; we shall take into consideration the principal apocryphal books, but only so far as the teaching that they contain is found to develop or supplement that of the canonical literature. We do not think it necessary to go further and discuss the Jewish theology of the time of Jesus and the apostles, since this subject has been treated, and well treated, by two French scholars, — MM. Nicolas and Stapfer.

We shall divide our work into three periods. The first, from Moses to the beginning of the eighth century, is distinguished by the preponderating influence exercised by traditional ideas and usages, modified only in part by early prophecy. The second, from the appearance of the oldest prophetical books to the end of the Exile, is marked by the great influence of prophecy, now at its apogee. The third, from the Exile to the first century before the Christian era, is characterized by the extraordinary influence of the written law and the priesthood.

We shall not, in every period, treat all the questions to which the documents bearing on it refer. This would be a decidedly mechanical process that would necessitate numerous repetitions. We shall treat, as far as possible,

in each period, questions that, for the time being, are most prominent, and refer to the same questions in the other periods only when they are presented in a new light.

## II. LITERATURE.

A historical discussion of the religion of Israel presupposes a knowledge of the literature of this people, and exact notions concerning the dates of the various documents belonging to this literature. We are of course not able here to enter into a discussion of the numerous and complicated problems that are treated in works on introduction to the Old Testament; we must confine ourselves to giving the results that appear to us certain or probable, referring the reader to special treatises for details.

The literature of the *first period* is the following: The oldest portion of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, which we shall call document A, the residue after removing the Deuteronomic portion and the Elohistic or Priestly document, of which more hereafter; the book of Judges, the books of Samuel, and the first ten chapters of 1 Kings, with the exception of the additions made by the last editor of these books; finally, the Song of Songs.

To the *second period* belong nearly all the prophetical books, in the following order: —

End of the ninth century or beginning of the eighth: Isa. xv. 1–xvi. 12. First half of the eighth century: Amos, Hosea, and perhaps Zech. ix.–xi. Second half of the eighth century: Isa. i.–xii.; xiv. 24–32; chaps. xvii.–xx.; xxi. 11–xxiii. 18; chaps. xxviii.–xxxiii.;

xxxvii. 21–35; xxxviii. 9–20; Micah, and perhaps Nahum. Second half of the seventh century: Jeremiah, with the exception of the last three chapters; Zephaniah, Habakkuk and perhaps Zech. xii.–xiv. Beginning of the sixth century and of the Exile: Ezekiel and Lamentations. Middle of the sixth century and toward the end of the Exile: Jer. l.–lii.; Isa. xiii. 1–xiv. 23; xxi. 1–10; chaps. xxiv.–xxvii.; chaps. xxxiv. f.; chaps. xl.–lxvi. (deutero-Isaiah).

To this period also probably belongs the book of Job, although it is difficult to say at just what date it was written.

In 622 was discovered in the temple at Jerusalem the legislation of Deuteronomy. Nearly all of this book and some fragments of the book of Joshua seem to be the work of the same hand or at least of the same epoch. We shall call this portion of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua document B.

It was at the end of this period when a single editor put the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings into their final form. Many portions of these books bear clear marks of the last redaction. The contents of the books of Kings, and those of the other historical books above mentioned, were, in great part, based on earlier written sources.

To this period also we refer the book of Ruth.

At the beginning of the *third period* stand the book of Haggai, written 520, and Zech. i.–viii., written between 520 and 518. It may be that Joel and Obadiah also date from this epoch, although the majority of critics regard the former as the oldest of the prophetical books, and some likewise consider the latter very

ancient. Malachi was written toward 440, and Jonah in the fifth or even in the fourth century.

In the fifth century occurred also the redaction of the most recent portions of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, usually styled the Elohistic document, which we shall call document C. The oldest portion of it is the section Lev. xvii.–xxvi., which was probably written during the Exile.

Toward the end of the fourth century, or at the beginning of the third, appeared Chronicles, as well as the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. They contain memoirs from the hands of Ezra and Nehemiah.

Ecclesiastes was written toward the end of the third century; so also Esther; Daniel dates from 167–164.

We merely mention here Proverbs and the Psalms, because they both belong to epochs very various and uncertain. A large number of proverbs were a sort of heritage of the whole nation, passing from mouth to mouth, and from one generation to another, a long time before they became part of a written collection. In the second and fourth parts of the book of Proverbs (x. 1–xxii. 16, and chaps. xxv.–xxix.) are found the oldest maxims. Chapters i.–ix. seem to be the latest portion; we think that they had their origin not earlier than the third period. The book, then, in its present form, cannot be older. It is difficult to say precisely at what epoch each of the various parts of the collection was formed, and when the whole received its final shape.

What we have just said of Proverbs applies, in part, to the Psalms. It is impossible to say just when the various psalms were written, when each of the five books of the Psalter was compiled, and when the whole

received its present form. There are psalms that may be attributed to David, and others that belong perhaps to the epoch of the Maccabees; but there is a lack of data reliable enough for determining the date of each. It seems certain, however, that in the first book of the Psalter we have the oldest psalms, and that the last books contain the latest.

The apocryphal books that will be taken into account were written between the beginning of the second and the end of the first century before the Christian era. To the second century also belongs the translation of the Seventy, to which frequent reference will be made.

We shall usually cite passages of the apocryphal books according to this version, because the various modern versions differ so widely from one another in the division of the chapters and verses.

As there is sometimes the same liability to confusion in the case of the canonical books, we shall cite passages taken from them according to Segond's translation, which is already very widely known and will grow in popularity. When we have occasion to refer to the original, we shall of course quote the Hebrew Bible. The reader who cannot refer to this text will do well to consult the Lausanne translation, which is more literal than the others, and which will better enable him to see the reason for, or the aptness of, a given citation.[1]

[1] [The translator might have substituted, for quotations from the French Bible, the words of the Revised English Version, and for those from the original, direct translations of his own, but it has seemed fairer to the author simply to translate all these quotations from the text of his book.]

# FIRST PERIOD.

## § 1. MOSAISM.

It is well known that the Pentateuch attributes to Moses a work of truly colossal proportions: the deliverance of the people Israel from bondage in Egypt, their religious and social organization, and finally a very extensive and complicated legislation. But, in view of the results of modern criticism, one may well ask whether it is now possible to know for certain anything concerning the person and work of the great legislator.

When one closely examines the historical books of the Old Testament, it is easily perceived that the historical sense was not developed to any greater extent among the Israelites than among most of the other peoples of antiquity; they constantly construct the past according to the present, or transfer the present to the past; they imagine the institutions existing at any given epoch as dating from the remotest antiquity, and write history accordingly. This should not, however, surprise us, since the same phenomenon is reproduced in the bosom of the Christian Church. Even now most Catholics imagine that the institutions of their church go back to Jesus and the apostles, and ecclesiastical history has been written in good faith from this point of view. In

the various Protestant churches also it is fondly believed that the dogmas held are a faithful expression of the teaching of Jesus and the apostles, and more than once this teaching has, in all sincerity, been modelled after modern dogmatic systems.

One has only to compare Chronicles with the parallel accounts of the books of Samuel and Kings, and the parallel accounts of these last with one another, to see that, in the various narratives, the same event is often reported in different ways, sometimes from entirely different points of view, and that the history of Israel is transformed and transfigured by passing from mouth to mouth and from one generation to another. The same fact may be observed in the Pentateuch.

In Genesis we have a double account of the creation and the deluge, and the two narratives differ greatly from each other. In the history of the patriarchs, also, many events are narrated two, or even three, times, and in a manner often very different. It is the same with other accounts of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua. This is explained by the fact that the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua are a compilation of materials drawn from sources of different epochs and origins. What is true of the narratives is equally true of the legislative portions. The oldest laws are found in Ex. xx.–xxiii. and xxxiv. Now, when this legislation is compared with that of Deuteronomy, it is discovered that, while there are numerous analogies, there are still more numerous differences. And when these two series of laws are placed alongside the other legislative provisions contained in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, the discrepancies appear even more pro-

nounced. The French work of M. Reuss on the Bible, and the majority of the commentaries, furnish abundant proof in support of these assertions.

These legislative collections, so different and often even contradictory, cannot all have originated with Moses. We have seen, indeed, that one portion of the legislation of the Pentateuch dates only from the time of Ezra, and another from the time of Josiah. There remains the oldest portion above mentioned. Is it by Moses? The most competent critics agree that it is not, but that, on the contrary, it did not originate before David. It has even been demonstrated that the Decalogue, the kernel of which may well be as old as Moses, in its present form, is not of so ancient a date. What, then, can we know for certain concerning the legislative activity of Moses, in which we are particularly interested? It is difficult to say. It has even been suggested that Moses is only a mythical personage. But since the people Israel attributed to him the laws successively developed among them, as they attributed their psalms to David and their proverbs to Solomon, we are authorized to think that Moses is a historical personage as much as these two kings, and that he was the first great legislator of Israel, as David was their first important hymnist, and Solomon their first distinguished didactic poet. Just, however, as it is next to impossible to distinguish the genuine psalms of David and the genuine proverbs of Solomon from those that were later erroneously attributed to them, so it is impossible to distinguish the laws originating with Moses from those that do not belong to him. We are perfectly certain that a large number of the laws of the Pentateuch are not Mosaic. There are others that may

be, although we have not the means of establishing the fact with certainty. We shall, therefore, at most, be able to arrive at the spirit of Mosaism, at its fundamental principles, by induction, starting from early prophetism and the religious and moral condition of the times following those of Moses. These principles we shall seek to unfold in the following paragraphs.

It will be understood, after what has just been said, why we have not begun our discussion with the patriarchs, as it has been the custom to do. Since it is next to impossible to distinguish with certainty historical data from later additions in the accounts respecting Moses, there can be still less hope of being able to make such a distinction in the narratives in Genesis relating to a more remote epoch. The contents of Genesis are certainly, to an even greater degree than those of the other books of the Pentateuch, a reflex of later times. We are able to learn from them what was the religious and moral ideal of the Israelites at the time when these various stories had their origin, but not what was the religious and moral life of the patriarchs themselves.

Certain isolated passages of the Old Testament teach us that the ancestors of Israel were devoted to the idolatrous usages of the other Semitic peoples until the time of Moses and Joshua.[1] As all subsequent history shows us that the inclination to idolatry remained dominant in Israel until the Exile, in spite of the energetic and incessant efforts of the prophets to extirpate

[1] Josh. xxiv. 2, 14, 23; Amos v. 25 f.; Ezek. xvi. 20 ff., 26 ff.; xx. 6 ff., 15 ff., 24 ff.; xxiii. 3, 8; comp. Gen. xxxi. 19, 30 ff.; xxxv. 2 ff.; Ex. xxxii.

it, we may conclude that these isolated references are perfectly historical, and that the picture of the religion of their ancestors that later generations painted and left us is an ideal picture.

## § 2. ANCIENT PROPHETISM AND THE ART OF DIVINATION.

Moses was not only the first legislator, but also the first genuine prophet of his people.[1] There is no doubt that he sought to impress his spirit upon the elect of his nation and thus provide himself with successors in his work. We read in the book of Numbers that, while he was yet living, the spirit of God and the gift of prophecy were bestowed upon a certain number of the elders of Israel.[2] It is therefore very probable that Moses had immediate successors, and that, beginning with this epoch, the succession of prophets was uninterrupted, though the early traditions of Israel, which are rich enough in military and political details, have preserved on this more spiritual subject only very vague and incomplete references.[3] Jeremiah expressly says that, after the exodus from Egypt, Jehovah constantly sent prophets to his people.[4] In the times of the Judges, however, the prophets seem to have been few in number.[5] Except Deborah, who is called a prophetess,[6] there is mention of a prophet only in Jud. vi. 7 ff. and 1 Sam. ii. 27 ff. But these various data do not furnish us exact

[1] Hos. xii. 13; Deut. xviii. 15, 18; xxxiv. 10.

[2] Chap. xi. 24 ff.

[3] Reuss, *Les Prophètes*, I. pp. 5, 7 f.; idem, *Gesch. der h. Schriften A. T.*, § 115; Schultz, *Old Testament Theology*, I. p. 239.

[4] Jer. vii. 25. [5] 1 Sam. iii. 1. [6] Jud. iv. 4.

and reliable indications touching the character and influence of early prophetism. It appears to us, with somewhat distinct outlines, first in Samuel, who is incontestably the most conspicuous personage, after Moses, in the history of Israel.

Samuel enjoyed a high degree of consideration among his people.[1] The best proof of this is the fact that "two rival dynasties appeal to him to establish their right to the throne." He performed the functions of a judge.[2] But he was greatest of all in the religious influence that he exerted. He contended vigorously against idolatry and all unfaithfulness to Jehovah.[3] His chief work, from a religious point of view, was the foundation of the schools of prophets, by which he became the promoter of a movement of the greatest importance for the future of the religion of Israel.

It is, no doubt, Samuel to whom must be attributed this remarkable institution. Before him there is no mention of it. There is, in fact, as we have seen, little reference to prophets as a class. Samuel, on the other hand, appears at the head of a guild of prophets,[4] schools of whom are found chiefly in the districts and places where he resides and pursues his calling. They are mentioned in connection with Gibeah, near Ramah, Bethel, Jericho, Gilgal;[5] that is, places chiefly in the mountains of Ephraim.[6] Now it is this region, and generally the places mentioned, in which we find Samuel sojourning. He had his house at Ramah, where he

[1] 1 Sam. iii. 20 f.; ix. 6; xii. 3–5; xxv. 1; xxviii. 3; Jer. xv. 1.
[2] 1 Sam. vii. 15. [3] 2 Sam. vii. 3–6; xv. 17 ff. [4] 1 Sam. xix. 20.
[5] 1 Sam. x. 5, 10; xix. 18–20; 2 Kings ii. 3, 5; iv. 38.
[6] 2 Kings v. 22.

usually lived, and where he was buried.[1] From Ramah he betook himself every year to Bethel, Gilgal, and Mispah, to judge the people.[2] At Gilgal he often gathered great popular assemblies.[3] We see him also at Gibeah.[4]

Maybaum always contends that Samuel did nothing but reform the schools of the prophets, which existed before his day; that he combated the art of divination which had thus far been chiefly cultivated therein; that he stamped them with a character more elevated, more ideal; and that thus he gave to prophetism the impulse resulting in the greater spirituality of later times.[5] This statement is not absolutely improbable; but it is not perfectly established, as it cannot be, since the positive data are too meagre on this point.

The pupils of these schools bore the name of sons of prophets,[6] and their teachers probably that of fathers.[7] These sons of prophets, sometimes also called simply prophets,[8] were very numerous. They are mentioned by hundreds.[9] They were of course mostly young persons,[10] but there were married men among them.[11] Later we find Elijah and Elisha at their head.[12] After these

[1] 1 Sam. vii. 17; viii. 4; xix. 18; xxv. 1; xxviii. 3.

[2] 1 Sam. vii. 15 f.

[3] 1 Sam. x. 8; xi. 14 f.; xiii. 18 ff.; xv. 33.

[4] 1 Sam. xiii. 15.

[5] *Entwickelung des isral. Prophetenthums*, pp. 38 ff.

[6] 1 Kings xx. 35; 2 Kings ii. 3, 5, 7, 15.

[7] 1 Sam. x. 12; 2 Kings ii. 12; comp. vi. 21; xiii. 14; Prov. i. 8; iv. 1.

[8] 1 Sam. xix. 20; 1 Kings xx. 35; comp. *vv.* 38, 41.

[9] 1 Kings xviii. 4, 13; xxii. 6; 2 Kings ii. 7, 16; iv. 43; vi. 1.

[10] 2 Kings v. 22; ix. 1, 4.

[11] 2 Kings iv. 1.

[12] 2 Kings ii. 15; iv. 1 ff., 38; vi. 1 ff.

two great prophets, history makes no further mention of them.

What was done in these schools of prophets, and what was the object of them? The sacred text teaches us next to nothing on this subject. One can gather from 1 Sam. x. 5, at most, only that the pupils of the prophets practised vocal and instrumental music. It may be taken for granted that in their meetings they practised, also, reading, writing, and speaking; that they were instructed in religion, social ethics, and law; that among them were preserved and developed the principles of Mosaism.[1] The essential object of these associations was evidently that pursued by Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, and all the genuine prophets of Israel; namely, the maintenance of the worship of Jehovah against the ceaseless attacks of idolatry. It was a grand task to which they were devoted in these schools of prophets. But they probably also practised the art of divination, which, as we shall see, was inseparable from ancient prophetism.

To get a somewhat adequate idea of this prophetism, which was far from being of the dignity of that of later times, one must not lose sight of what is reported (1 Sam. xix. 20 ff.) of an assembly of disciples of prophets, over which Samuel himself presided. We are told that Saul sent thither, three times, persons to take David, and that these messengers, seeing the assembly prophesying, were themselves also seized by the spirit of God, and, in their turn, made to prophesy; that Saul, also, upon betaking himself thither in person, fell

[1] Reuss, *Les Prophètes*, I. p. 11; *Geschichte*, § 119; [Robertson, *Early Religion of Israel*, pp. 91 ff.].

under the same influence of the spirit of God, and prophesied, stripping, like the others, his garments from him, and remaining a day and a night stretched naked on the ground. Hence we see that, anciently, those who wished to prophesy put themselves into a state of religious ecstasy or exaltation, which was induced by the aid of music, songs and probably instrumental accompaniments to dancing, and which might produce the strangest effects, finally resulting in complete and prolonged prostration.

Prophecy, thus understood, could not consist of discourses like the prophetic preaching, since prophets, gathered in great numbers, prophesied at the same time. Reuss, therefore, here and elsewhere, renders the word prophesy by *sing* [*chanter*]. The correctness of this rendering appears from 1 Sam. x. 5, where reference is made to a band of prophets coming down from the high place, preceded by the lute, the tambourine, the flute, and the harp, and prophesying. Reuss, on this passage, makes the following remark: "The band, preceded by instruments, sang hymns, sacred songs, probably dancing and evincing by gestures a certain momentary exaltation. There is the less reason for thinking of discourses, since the prophets, who are numerous, all speak and have no hearers." We see from 2 Kings iii. 15, that, still later, music was considered an indispensable means of producing prophetic inspiration.

The fact that all sorts of eccentricities were mingled with ancient prophetism, is evidently the reason why the prophets are sometimes treated as fools or madmen.[1] The curious symbolic acts that they employed to express

[1] Hos. ix. 7; Jer. xxix. 26; 2 Kings ix. 11.

their idea the more picturesquely, also helped to gain them this reputation.[1]

Beginning with Samuel and the appearance of the schools of prophets, one meets prophets in Israel for several centuries. The most influential of those who belong to our period seem to have been Elijah and his disciple Elisha. We do not, however, consider it necessary to dwell on everything that is reported concerning them. For it is clear that, when the historical books that tell us of them were edited, their deeds and teachings were to some extent colored by the influence of later prophetism. We come to perceive this in the period following, and by the help of the most reliable documents; namely, the writings emanating from the prophets themselves. For the present we shall confine ourselves to noticing the features peculiar to ancient prophetism of which we have not thus far spoken.

In ancient times it was customary to go to consult the prophets as diviners. They were considered as, first of all, seers,[2] men who saw things that others were not able to see. Thus Saul went to Samuel to learn from him what had become of his father's stray asses;[3] Jeroboam sent his wife to the prophet Ahijah to ask what would happen to his sick son;[4] and Benhadad, king of Syria, sent to consult Elisha as to whether he should recover from his sickness.[5] It appears also, from these three and other cases,[6] that the profession of a seer was a remunerative one.

[1] 1 Kings xi. 29 ff.; xx. 35; xxii. 11; 2 Kings xiii. 15 ff.; Isa. viii. 1; xx. 2 f.; Jer. xix. 1 ff., 10 ff.; xxvii. 1 ff., 12 ff.; xxviii. 10 ff.; xliii. 8 ff.; li. 59 ff.; Ezek. xxiv. 15 ff.; xxxvii. 15 ff.

[2] 1 Sam. ix. 9. [3] Chap. ix. [4] 1 Kings xiv. 1 ff. [5] 2 Kings viii. 7 ff.

[6] Num. xxii. 7; 1 Kings xiii. 7; 2 Kings v. 15; Mic. iii. 11.

In ancient times dreams and visions must have played an important part in the activity of the prophets. An old passage, indeed, attributes to Jehovah these words: "When there is among you a prophet, in a vision will I, Jehovah, reveal myself to him; in a dream will I speak to him."[1] Visions and dreams, as means of revelation, occupy a large place even in the history of the patriarchs.[2] There are references to dreams of this kind also in Jud. vii. 13 ff. and 1 Kings iii. 5 ff. Finally, another old passage, 1 Sam. xxviii. 6, mentions dreams as employed by Jehovah equally with *urim* and prophets. Later, however, there seems to have been great distrust of this means of revelation.[3]

It is evident that ancient prophetism was not clearly distinguished from the art of divination as it was practised among almost all the peoples. This explains why it was admitted in Israel that Jehovah spoke by the mouths of foreign diviners, by that of Balaam, for example;[4] that the priests and diviners of the Philistines were able to make truthful announcements;[5] that God was able to reveal himself in dreams and speak to Gentiles as well as to the patriarchs.[6] Moses and his miracles are placed upon almost the same level as the magicians of Egypt and their prodigies.[7]

All this, moreover, finds confirmation in some other usages of which this is the place to speak. Thus, the

[1] Num. xii. 6; comp. Joel ii. 28; Job xxxiii. 15.

[2] Gen. xv. 1 ff., 12 ff.; xxviii. 12 ff.; xxxi. 10, 24; xxxvii. 5 ff., 9 ff.; xlvi. 2 ff.

[3] Jer. xxiii. 25 ff.; xxvii. 9; xxix. 8; Zech. x. 2; Deut. xiii. 1 ff.; Eccl. v. 7.

[4] Num. xxiii. 5 ff.; xxiv. 2 ff.

[5] 1 Sam. vi. 2 ff.

[6] Gen. xx. 3 ff.; xl. 5 ff.; xli. 1 ff.

[7] Ex. vii. 11 f.; viii. 3, 14.

direction of Jehovah was asked in difficult circumstances, in embarrassing situations.[1] This was ordinarily done at the sanctuary and through the mediation of the priest.[2] Yet, according to document A, the people consulted God also by the aid of Moses,[3] who, besides, as we shall see, performed sacerdotal functions and, as we have already seen, was a prophet. Samuel also was at the same time priest and prophet. Generally speaking, as long as the prophetism of Israel was more or less confounded with the art of divination, the priests and the prophets did not form two distinct classes of men of God: every priest was a prophet or diviner, and every prophet was a diviner and a priest, as was the case among most of the peoples.[4]

In consulting Jehovah, *urim* and *thummim* were employed. "The word *urim* by virtue of its etymology points to the enlightening effect, *thummim* to the correctness and reliability, of the divine response."[5] This oracle was employed from the earliest times, as is apparent from an old passage, where it appears as a means of revelation with dreams and prophets;[6] and as indicated by Deut. xxxiii. 8, it was early entrusted to the sacerdotal caste. According to document C, the high-priest alone could be its guardian, the *urim* and *thummim* forming part of his sacerdotal dress.[7]

[1] Gen. xxv. 22; Ex. xviii. 15; Josh. ix. 14; Jud. i. 1; xx. 23; 1 Sam. x. 22; xxiii. 2; xxviii. 6; 2 Sam. ii. 1; v. 19, 23 ff.; xxi. 1.

[2] Jud. xviii. 5 f.; xx. 18, 27; 1 Sam. xiv. 36 f.; xxii. 9 f., 13.

[3] Ex. xviii. 15; xxxiii. 7.

[4] Wellhausen, *History of Israel*, p. 396; Maybaum, pp. 7 ff.; [W. Robertson Smith, *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 285].

[5] Oehler, *Old Testament Theology*, § 97.

[6] 1 Sam xxviii. 6.

[7] Ex. xxviii. 30; Lev. viii. 8; Num. xxvii. 21.

The archæologists have been at great pains to explain of what this oracle consisted, and how one proceeded to learn by its aid the will of God. It is probable that the response was given by means of the lot;[1] for the Israelites made use of it from the remotest antiquity in the conviction that the result obtained from it conformed to the will of God and the truth.[2]

In consulting God, the *ephod*, also, was employed. This term ordinarily designates a sacerdotal garment.[3] But it seems also to have denoted a carved image, or rather the plating that covered this image, which was an object of adoration, and probably a symbolical representation of Jehovah.[4] This is the case, also, 1 Sam. xxiii. 9 ff., xxx. 7 f., where the ephod appears precisely like an oracle.[5] One may suppose that the lot also was used when God was consulted by means of the ephod.

The Israelites sometimes asked God to reveal to them his will by a certain sign. Eliezer did so, that he might recognize the young woman who was to be the wife of Isaac;[6] and Gideon, that he might be assured that Jehovah was speaking to him, and had chosen him to deliver Israel.[7] Or God himself designated the sign by which his servants might perceive what they were to

[1] Riehm's *Handwörterbuch*, pp. 916 f.; [W. R. Smith, *Old Test.*, pp. 42 f.].

[2] Josh. vii. 14 ff.; xiv. 2; 1 Sam. x. 20 ff.; xiv. 44 f.; Num. xxvi. 55 f.; Prov. xvi. 33; xviii. 18.

[3] 1 Sam. ii. 18; xxii. 18; 2 Sam. vi. 14; Ex. xxviii. 6 ff.

[4] Jud. viii. 27; xvii. 5; xviii. 14, 18, 20; 1 Sam. xxi. 9; xxiii. 6; Hos. iii. 4.

[5] Reuss on the passages cited, and *Gesch.*, § 139; Vatke, *Bibl. Theol.*, pp. 267 ff.; [Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1892, pp. 43, 67, 69].

[6] Gen. xxiv. 14 ff.

[7] Jud. vi. 17 ff., 36 ff.

do. It was such a sign by means of which Gideon knew who were the men that he was to select to contend with the Midianites,[1] and obtained the assurance that Jehovah had delivered the hostile camp into his hands;[2] such a sign also notified David of the moment when Jehovah would march before him to smite the Philistines.[3]

We might mention, further, among the usages of this kind, necromancy, which is also found employed by other peoples of antiquity.[4] We learn from 1 Sam. xxviii. that, toward the end of the reign of Saul, when Jehovah no longer answered the king by dreams, or by *urim*, or by the prophets, the king betook himself to a woman of Endor, who summoned the dead, that she might cause Samuel to rise before him; and this, according to the narrative, actually took place. From the same passage we learn that Saul had previously banished necromancers from the country, which proves that anciently this means of divination was employed in Israel. Finally, we see that the editor of our narrative believed in the possibility of summoning the dead and obtaining through them knowledge of the future. In later times this means of divination again came into use.[5]

[1] Jud. vii. 4 ff. [2] Jud. vii. 9 ff. [3] 2 Sam. v. 23–25.

[4] Winer, art. *Todtenbeschwörer;* [Smith, *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. *Divination*].

[5] 2 Kings xxi 6.; xxiii. 24; comp. Isa. viii. 19; xxix. 4; Deut. xviii. 11; Lev. xix. 31; xx. 6, 27.

## § 3. THE IDEA OF GOD.

This idea is fundamental in the Israelitish as in every other religion. In order to find a safe point of departure for it, we shall begin by considering the religious thoughts that are expressed in the song of Deborah. It is generally admitted that this passage is the oldest document of any importance in Hebrew literature that has been preserved to us, and that it dates from the very epoch to which it relates.

In this poem, Jehovah is called the God of Israel,[1] and Israel the people of Jehovah.[2] The victory of Israel is due to Jehovah, who, for this reason, is exalted by our song.[3] The cause of Israel is the cause of Jehovah, the enemies of the one are the enemies of the other, the succor lent to Israel is lent to Jehovah.[4] Jehovah is regarded as dwelling on Sinai, whence he comes across the Southland to succor his people, making the earth and the heavens tremble.[5]

The thought that Jehovah is the God of Israel, is here expressed with a conviction so firm, that it cannot be of recent date, but must certainly go back as far as Moses, if not farther. The first words of the decalogue: "I am Jehovah thy God, who caused thee to go forth from the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage; thou shalt not have other gods before my face" — these words, which contain the fundamental law of Israel, may, then, well be Mosaic. The same may be said of the theocratic idea, which constitutes the essence of the religion of Israel, the idea that Jehovah is the veritable

[1] Jud. v. 3, 5. [2] *v.* 11. [3] *vv.* 2 f., 9, 11, 13.
[4] *vv.* 23, 31. [5] *vv.* 4 f.

king of his people, and that he directs all that concerns them; for it is implied in this declaration of the decalogue, and it is an evident inference from the song of Deborah. When Gideon declines the crown, saying to his fellow-citizens, "Jehovah shall be your king"[1] he thereby announces a Mosaic principle. Samuel also conforms to this principle when he opposes the establishment of the monarchy in Israel.[2] The words put into the mouth of Jehovah and addressed to Samuel: "It is not thou whom they reject; it is I whom they reject, that I may no longer reign over them," admirably describe this ancient point of view.

Though this idea, that Jehovah alone is the God of Israel, and that the Israelites should not worship other gods, can be traced to Moses, we cannot place the date of absolute monotheism so early. It certainly did not appear in Israel until much later. We see, indeed, that not only the people, but the kings, even Solomon himself, who had had a temple built for Jehovah, were devoted to the worship of strange gods, or favored it. This proves that they attributed a real existence to these gods. We know, moreover, that, in antiquity, a people that had frequent intercourse with other peoples readily adopted, besides its national god or gods, the god or gods of a friendly nation, or a nation that had conquered them, or that they themselves had reduced to submission. The Israelites, in following this custom, did not mean to desert Jehovah, nor did they wish to be unfaithful to him; they merely associated with him other gods, practised what has properly been called syncretism. Though the sacred authors of a later epoch, taking the

[1] Jud. viii. 23. [2] 1 Sam. viii.

point of view of pure or absolute monotheism, very severely reprobated this way of thinking and acting, the early Israelites doubtless judged otherwise concerning it, because they did not see in foreign gods purely imaginary beings, least of all abominations, as they were afterwards called, but real gods as able as Jehovah to protect and bless their worshippers.

We see that the most faithful Israelites shared these ideas. Thus Jacob seems astonished at the presence of Jehovah on a foreign soil.[1] He promises to take him for his God if he will grant him protection.[2] This implies the possibility of a different choice and the existence of other gods. When, at a later date, this style of thought was attributed to the patriarchs, the most enlightened in Israel had evidently not passed this point of view.[3] This is proven by several other notable examples. Thus Jephthah recognizes the actual existence of Chemosh, the god of the Moabites.[4] Joash, the father of Gideon, says: "If Baal is a god, let him plead his own cause, since his altar has been overthrown."[5] If, by this speech, Joash does not seem exactly to recognize in Baal a god, he at least admits the possibility that there may be other gods than Jehovah. David himself seems to believe, with his contemporaries, that it is not Jehovah, but other gods, who rule, and can be worshipped outside the land of Canaan.[6] He conveys the thought that the God of Israel is a

[1] Gen. xxviii. 16. [2] Gen. xxviii. 20 ff.

[3] Baudissin, *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgesch.*, I. pp. 61, 157 f.; [W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel*, pp. 53 ff.; Montefiore, *Lectures*, pp. 34 ff.].

[4] Jud. xi. 24; comp. Num. xxi. 29.

[5] Jud. vi. 31. [6] 1 Sam. xxvi. 19 f.

national God.[1] Naaman thinks that he must carry to Syria some of the soil of the land of Canaan, in order to be able to rear an altar in honor of Jehovah;[2] "he feels himself in the domain of Jehovah only on the soil of the land of Israel,"[3] and Elisha seems to agree with him, since he makes no objection. Naomi and Ruth think that, in the land of Moab, one must, of necessity, serve the gods of the Moabites, as the God of Israel is served in the land of Canaan.[4]

The existence of foreign gods is also doubtless presupposed in the old passages that forbid the worship of these gods, like Ex. xx. 2 f., and in those that assert that Jehovah is greater than they, like Ex. xv. 11.[5] In the old documents the expressions that designate Jehovah as a peculiar God, especially the name "God of the Hebrews,"[6] also seem to imply the thought that he is a purely national God.[7]

Schultz says, and justly, that on account of the potent realism of antiquity, the first impression could not have been that the foreign gods were only products of the imagination; that it is entirely natural that the gods of the gentile world should at first be placed side by side with the God of Israel. He adds, that it must never be forgotten that the religion of the Old Testament is purely practical; that it is not intended first of all to give instruction concerning the celestial world, but to waken the conviction that salvation is to be found only in the God of the covenant and in the covenant with

[1] 1 Sam. xvii. 46. [2] 2 Kings v. 17. [3] Baudissin, I. p. 46.
[4] Ruth i. 15 ff.; ii. 12. [5] Baudissin, I. pp. 66 ff., 79.
[6] See especially Ex. iii. 18; vii. 16.
[7] Baudissin, I. pp. 156 f.; [Schultz, *Theology*, I. pp. 178 f.].

him; that its first task is to teach, not that there cannot be any other deities besides the God of Israel, but that Israel must have none besides him.[1]

If the ancient Israelites had not yet attained to absolute monotheism, they had just as little conception of the idea of the perfect spirituality of God. They represented him to themselves, on the contrary, under the form of man. According to the biblical narratives, God visits Abraham with two companions; he accepts the hospitality that the patriarch offers him; he converses with him and Sarah, then goes away toward Sodom, accompanied by his host, to whom, on the way, he makes known his purpose to destroy the guilty cities.[2] He forms man out of the dust of the ground, as any artist would do; he breathes into his nostrils the breath of life; he plants a garden in Eden; he takes a rib of the man to make the woman, and carefully closes up the flesh in place of it; he rests from the work of creation when he has finished it.[3] After the fall he appears in the garden of Eden; he walks through it; he calls Adam and Eve; he informs them of the penalties that will overtake them; then he makes them garments of skin and clothes them.[4] He closes the door of the ark upon Noah.[5] He smells the pleasant odor of the burnt-offering that the latter offers him.[6] He engages in a hand-to-hand conflict, like a man, with Jacob.[7] He attacks Moses in the night, and attempts to kill him;[8] he speaks to him as one person speaks to another;[9] he buries him after his

[1] *Theology*, I. pp. 181 f.; comp. Baudissin, I. pp. 156, 175.
[2] Gen. xviii. f. [3] Gen. ii. 7 f.; 21 f., 3. [4] Gen. iii. 8–20.
[5] Gen. vii. 16. [6] Gen. viii. 21. [7] Gen. xxxii. 24 ff.
[8] Ex. iv. 24. [9] Ex. xxxiii. 11; Num. xii. 8.

death;[1] he pronounces the ten words of the decalogue,[2] and engraves them on tables of stone.[3] He raises his hand to take an oath.[4] It is only necessary to read a few pages of the prophets or the Psalms to be convinced that God is regarded as possessing all the members and functions of the human body. He is even said to hiss,[5] to cry,[6] to laugh,[7] to sleep and awake.[8]

It is clear that in the prophets and the Psalms these expressions belong to the poetic style. But originally, and even at a later date in the mouth of the people, they were not merely rhetorical; they corresponded to the imperfect ideas that were current respecting the Deity. When the narratives of the Pentateuch, from which we have taken the examples above cited, were composed, they were certainly taken in their literal signification. We think that even at the time when the original narrators borrowed them from popular tradition to stereotype them in writing, they were still generally taken in this sense.

Since God was represented under the human form, it was natural to put him into a certain place. According to the whole Old Testament, God dwells in heaven, whence he observes what happens on the earth, and whence he descends to do what he does among men. Later, the ideas on this subject were comparatively enlightened; but in ancient times, as several stories prove, the current conception was rather gross. Thus Jehovah comes down to see the city and the tower of

[1] Deut. xxxiv. 6. [2] Ex. xx. 1 ff. [3] Ex. xxxii. 16; xxxiv. 1.
[4] Ex. vi. 8; Num. xiv. 30; Deut. xxxii. 40.
[5] Isa. v. 26; vii. 18. [6] Isa. xlii. 13 f.; Jer. xxv. 30.
[7] Ps. ii. 4; lix. 8. [8] Ps. xliv. 23; lxxviii. 65.

Babel, that the children of men are building; he says, "Come, let us go down and confound their speech."[1] In view of the corruption of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, he says: "I will go down and see if they have acted altogether according to the report that hath come to me, and if it is not so, I shall know it."[2] He appears to Moses and declares to him that he has come down to deliver his people from the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them into the land of Canaan.[3] When the law is promulgated, he comes down upon Mount Sinai.[4] And these are not the only instances of this kind.[5]

We know that, according to the whole Old Testament, Jehovah is regarded as dwelling in the midst of his people, and more especially in the sanctuary. This was only another way of localizing him. This idea, which was later spiritualized, was in ancient times certainly very grossly conceived. According to a passage of the song of Deborah already cited, Sinai was originally considered the peculiar abode of the God of Israel; the same opinion recurs in other passages, especially in the twenty-fourth chapter of Exodus, where we see Moses and his companions ascending Sinai to draw near to Jehovah.

Other imperfections, the imperfect affections and sentiments of the human soul, were attributed to God. He is seized with jealousy on seeing men exalting themselves above their ordinary condition, and he feels himself obliged to oppose their proud designs, in order to

[1] Gen. xi. 5, 7. [2] Gen. xviii. 21. [3] Ex. iii. 8.
[4] Ex. xix. 9, 11, 18, 20; comp. xxxiv. 5.
[5] Num. xi. 17, 25; xii. 5; xxii. 9, 20; xxiii. 3 f., 16.

maintain the separation that exists between him and them.[1] He is obliged to put Abraham to the proof, in order to learn that he is faithful to him.[2] In all the books of the Old Testament there are references to oaths of God, to repentance on his part, to his jealousy, to his anger, to his vengeance. But moral imperfections, even more shocking, were attributed to him. It is related that he incited Moses and the Israelites to cheat and rob the Egyptians, and that he assisted them in this attempt.[3] Nowhere in antiquity was there any obligation felt toward strangers, least of all toward enemies. Jehovah, therefore, inasmuch as he was regarded as exclusively or especially the national God of Israel, had, it was thought, no actual obligations toward the enemies of Israel.

Certain primitive usages show us that as the ancient Israelites did not regard God as a pure spirit, neither did they know how to worship him in spirit. We shall see farther on how important was the part played by external observances in Israel, and particularly by the sacred ark, whose presence was identified with that of Jehovah himself. There were other objects of worship with reference to which superstitious ideas were current.

The teraphim, which we find even in the family of the patriarchs,[4] reappear in the house of David[5] and elsewhere, and the worshippers of Jehovah ascribed to them great value, as well as to other sacred statues and images, among which must be reckoned the ephod,

[1] Gen. iii. 22; xi. 6 f.
[2] Gen. xxii. 1 ff., 12; comp. Ex. xv. 25; xx. 20.
[3] Ex. iii. 18, 22; xi. 2 f.; xii. 35 f.
[4] Gen. xxxi. 19, 30 ff. [5] 1 Sam. xix. 13, 16.

mentioned in the same connection and placed upon the same level.[1] The worship of the brazen serpent was also long continued in Israel, and finally condemned as idolatry;[2] it was the same with the calves prepared in honor of Jehovah. This is the way in which these last are represented, Ex. xxxii. 4 f. Jeroboam also doubtless set up the two calves at Bethel and Dan in honor of Jehovah, although it was later regarded only as an act of idolatry.[3]

If, as we saw at the beginning of this paragraph, one may say that the first commandment of the decalogue may be Mosaic, we now see, at the end of it, that one may seriously doubt whether the second, which absolutely forbids the worship of images, can be so ancient. For even a David had sacred images in his house, and used them in consulting Jehovah, which would be inexplicable if, in his day, the second commandment was a fundamental law of the religion of Israel.

## § 4. THE COVENANT OF JEHOVAH WITH ISRAEL.

In the fifteenth chapter of Genesis, document A relates how Jehovah made a covenant with Abraham, the father of the faithful. Farther on it tells how the covenant between Jehovah and the people Israel was solemnly confirmed through the mediation of Moses at Sinai.[4] The detailed explanation of this important

[1] Jud. xvii. 5; xviii. 14 ff., 30.; viii. 27; Hos. iii. 4; comp. Zech. x. 2; 2 Kings xxiii. 24.

[2] Num. xxi. 5 ff.; 2 Kings xviii. 4.

[3] 1 Kings xii. 28 ff.; 2 Kings x. 29; xvii. 16; comp. Hos. viii. 5 f.; x. 5.

[4] Ex. xix. – xxiv.

point, taken from one of the sources, is followed by a second and briefer one, derived from another source.[1]

It should be noticed that we have here very old portions of document A, based perhaps on written documents still older, at all events on ancient traditions. The idea of the covenant between Jehovah and Israel is of very ancient date. It is certainly as old as Moses, the founder of the Israelitish theocracy, since there is no later epoch to be found at which it could have arisen.[2] In the book of Judges, and those of Samuel, even in the oldest passages that they contain, like the song of Deborah, Jehovah is everywhere regarded as the God of Israel, and Israel as the people of Jehovah. This idea is found, from the start, as a fundamental feature of the teaching of the prophets. It appears on every page of the Old Testament. We must, then, even in this period, show in what the covenant of Jehovah with Israel consists, and what are its essential characteristics.

On the part of Jehovah, the covenant with Israel is simply a gratuitous favor, a free and spontaneous act. It is Jehovah who takes the initiative in it, and not Israel. According even to document A, God caused the children of Israel to be told at the time when he made a covenant with them, that, while the whole earth belonged to him, he took them from among all the peoples of the earth that he might make them his peculiar people.[3] But the gratuitousness of this favor is even more strongly emphasized in Deuteronomy.[4]

[1] Ex. xxxiv. 10–28.

[2] Reuss, *Gesch.*, § 69; Vatke, pp. 184 ff., 238; [Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, I. pp. 292 f.].

[3] Ex. xix. 5.

[4] iv. 37 f.; vii. 6 – viii. 8, 17 f.; x. 14 f.

The relations established between Jehovah and his people as the result of this covenant are described in various ways. First of all, this people thus becomes the people of Jehovah, his property,[1] his inheritance,[2] over which he wishes to rule as master, as king.[3] Oehler justly remarks that when Jehovah, in making a covenant with Israel, requires that they be a holy people and a kingdom of priests, this implies the thought that the people Israel must be separated from all the other peoples, and that they must be consecrated to him, belong to him.[4] There are passages of document A and of others that express this thought with great precision,[5] a thought which is the essence of the term sanctity when it is applied to men and things in the Old Testament.[6] Mention should also be made of the fact that Israel was prohibited from making covenants with the other peoples.[7]

The relation between Jehovah and Israel, by virtue of their covenant, is secondly regarded as that between a father and his children. Jehovah is the father of the people, inasmuch as he has conquered, formed, created them, or will do so to them in the future.[8] Jehovah is

[1] Jud. v. 11; Ex. xv. 16; xix. 5 f.; vi. 7; Num. xvi. 41; Deut. vii. 6; xiv. 2; xxvi. 18.

[2] Ex. xxxiv. 9; 1 Sam. x. 1; 2 Sam. xiv. 16; xx. 19; xxi. 3; Mic. vii. 14, 18; Deut. xxxii. 9; iv. 20; ix. 26, 29, etc.

[3] Deut. xxxiii. 5; Jud. viii. 23; 1 Sam. viii. 5–7; Mic. ii. 13; iv. 7; Isa. vi. 5; xxxiii. 22, etc.

[4] § 82.

[5] Ex. xix. 4–6; xxii. 31; Lev. xx. 24–26; Deut. vii. 6; xiv. 2; xxvi. 18 f.

[6] Baudissin, II. pp. 40 ff., 61 ff.; [W. R. Smith, *Prophets*, pp. 224 ff.].

[7] Ex. xxiii. 32; xxxiv. 11 f.; Deut. vii. 1 ff.

[8] Deut. xxxii. 6; Jer. iii. 4, 19; xxxi. 9; Isa. lxiii. 16; lxiv. 8; Mal. i. 6; ii. 10.

often said to have borne his people, to have formed and created them.[1] This he did when he brought Israel, his son, from bondage in Egypt,[2] then after this painful delivery, when he nourished and reared him.[3] By bearing and forming his people, Jehovah acquired a right to them as a father acquires one to a son, a favorite, a first-born son.[4]

In a third series of passages, the relation existing between Jehovah and Israel is compared with the conjugal tie, Jehovah being the husband, and Israel the wife — unfortunately very often an unfaithful wife, whom the husband may accuse of unfaithfulness, adultery, prostitution, and whom he has the right to divorce.[5] In numerous passages, idolatry, the worship of foreign gods, consisting in giving one's self to these gods and being unfaithful to Jehovah, is treated as prostitution.[6]

Finally, there are passages in which the Israelites are individually called the servants of Jehovah,[7] and others in which Israel is collectively regarded as the servant of the God, who chose them for his peculiar people.[8] Jehovah is also generally addressed as the Lord.

The various relations established between Jehovah

[1] Deut. xxxii. 18; Hos. viii. 14; Isa. xliii. 1, 7, 15, 21; etc.

[2] Ex. iv. 22 f.; Hos. xi. 1; comp. xii. 9; xiii. 4.

[3] Hos. xi. 3; Isa. i. 2; xlvi. 3; Deut. i. 31; viii. 5.

[4] Ex. iv. 22; Jer. xxxi. 9, 20; comp. Hos. i. 10.

[5] Hos. i.–iii.; Jer. ii. 20; iii. 1, 8, 20; Ezek. xvi.; xxiii.; Isa. liv. 5 f.; lxii. 5.

[6] Ex. xxxiv. 15 f.; Jud. ii. 17; Hos. iv. 15; v. 3 f.; vi. 10; ix. 1; Jer. ii. 23–25; iii. 8 ff.; xiii. 27; etc.

[7] Deut. xxxii. 36, 43; Lev. xxv. 42, 55; 1 Kings viii. 32, 36; etc.

[8] Jer. xxx. 10; xlvi. 27 f.; Eze. xxviii. 25; xxxvii. 25; Isa. xli. 8 f.; xlii. 19; xliii. 10; etc.

and Israel imply, on the part of God, authority, inasmuch as he is king, father, husband, and lord of Israel; they imply also his love and faithfulness. The condition of Israel, as people, son, wife, and servant of Jehovah, on the other hand, implies respectful, docile, humble obedience, as well as gratitude, love, and faithfulness. These respective rights and duties of Jehovah and his people are expressed in a great variety of forms, which will be considered hereafter.

While we are discussing the essential characteristics of the old covenant, we must further remark that this covenant concerns the people Israel as a people. The individual is almost completely overshadowed by the nation. Nothing is more foreign to the general tone of the Old Testament than our modern individualism. One became a member of the old covenant, not by personal adherence, but by birth, by descent from the fathers, and by circumcision.

This prime sacrament of the old covenant, being bestowed only upon male children, evidently implies a superiority of men over women; the true Israel is composed of the stronger sex. Heads of families played the leading part. That a family should be Israelite, it was only essential that its head should be such; its other members were of only secondary importance in all respects, and therefore also in matters of religion.

Individualism, however, finds partial satisfaction in the conditions and obligations that every Israelite must fulfil in order to partake in the benefits of the covenant, in the privileges granted by Jehovah to his people. These conditions and obligations, which the people Israel had to agree faithfully to fulfil, when Jehovah

made a covenant with them,[1] we shall have to discuss more in detail in various parts of our work.

The above discussion shows that the covenant between Jehovah and Israel has justly been called a synallagmatic contract, implying reciprocal obligations between the two contracting parties, faithfulness on the part of God, who chose his people out of sheer grace, as well as on the part of the people graciously chosen. Hence the essentially moral basis of the old covenant, and its superiority over all the other religions of antiquity. This covenant, also, in spite of its particularism, and all the imperfections that it contained, was capable of remarkable development, and of final completion in the new covenant established by the gospel.

## § 5. ETHICAL LIFE.

If we wish to describe the ethical ideal that was formed in our period, we have only to allow ourselves to be guided by the oldest legislation. But we may also take into account the great figures, more or less idealized, of the patriarchal and the following epochs, as they are represented in the oldest documents; for they bear the visible stamp of ancient Israelitish morals; are, as it were, the reflex of them.

The most perfect portrait of the patriarchal epoch is that of Abraham. It is evident that to this father of the people Israel, with whom God made the first special covenant, were attributed all the virtues of a true Israelite. Abraham, it is said, observed all the commands of God,[2]

[1] Ex. xix. 5–8; xxiv. 3, 7. [2] Gen. xxvi. 5.

commanded his house to keep the way of Jehovah, to practise justice.[1] He is a perfect model of confidence in God and obedience to him.[2] In his relations with his equals he shows a spirit of peace, charity, and disinterestedness.[3] He gives proof of courage when he is called upon to succor a brother;[4] he practises hospitality toward strangers;[5] he shows compassion for the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah when they are threatened with destruction.[6]

Next to Abraham, David is the most ideal figure of the Old Testament, the model for kings after God's own heart, the type of the Messiah, of the perfect king of the glorious era of the last days. Even as a young man, he seems animated by the most complete confidence in God.[7] He is submissive to Jehovah and filled with a genuine spirit of prayer.[8] He shows himself repentant after his faults[9] and grateful for the favors of God.[10] He is imbued with a tender and faithful friendship for Jonathan.[11] He gives proof of generosity toward Saul, his enemy, and of reverence for the anointed of Jehovah.[12] It is with the profoundest sorrow that he hears of the death of his rebellious son,[13] or sees the people punished on his account.[14] He inspires his soldiers with the spirit of justice.[15]

[1] Gen. xviii. 19. [2] Gen. xii. 1 ff.; xv. 6; xxii. 1 ff.
[3] Gen. xiii. 7–9; comp. xiv. 21–24.
[4] Gen. xiv. 13 ff. [5] Gen. xviii. 2 ff.; comp. xix. 1 ff.
[6] Gen. xviii. 23 ff. [7] 1 Sam. xvii. 34 ff., 45 ff.
[8] 2 Sam. vii.; xv. 25 f.; xvi. 11; xxiv. 14.
[9] 2 Sam. xii. 1–23; xxiv. 10 ff., 17. [10] 2 Sam. xxii.
[11] 1 Sam. xviii. 3; xx. 8, 16, 42; xxiii. 16–18; 2 Sam. i. 26.
[12] 1 Sam. xxiv.; xxvi. [13] 2 Sam. xix. 1 ff.
[14] 2 Sam. xxiv. 17. [15] 1 Sam. xxx. 21–25.

This ethical ideal of the ancient Israelites is, however, far from perfect. The patriarchs use deception toward the stranger, as if it were a lawful practice.[1] Polygamy is not considered an evil,[2] nor intemperance in eating and drinking a vice.[3] Great license in morals is tolerated.[4] Barbarity is practised in war, and generally toward adversaries, as the case of David himself proves.[5] Suicide does not appear culpable.[6]

In spite of polygamy, which was freely practised, marriage was regarded with profound respect,[7] and woman was greatly honored; it is only necessary to recall the fact that from remote antiquity there were prophetesses to be found in Israel.[8] According to Gen. xxiv. the relations between masters and servants were excellent.

We pass now to the oldest legal fragments; namely, Ex. xx.–xxiii. and xxxiv. 11–26. At the beginning of the former is found the decalogue, reproduced, with some variations, Deut. v. It must be very ancient, at least in its original tenor. This may be approximately reached by removing the portions that differ, in the two recensions, and clearly appear to be later additions. The decalogue by no means contains the whole of

[1] Gen. xii. 12 ff.; xx. 1 ff.; xxvi. 7 ff.; comp. xxvii. 6 ff.

[2] Gen. xvi.; xxii. 24; xxv. 6; xxvi. 34; xxviii. 9; xxix. f.; xxxvi. 2, 12; Jud. viii. 30.

[3] Gen. ix. 21, 24; xliii. 34; 2 Sam. xi. 13.

[4] Gen. xxxviii. 15 ff.; Jud. xvi. 1, 4; comp. xi. 1.

[5] Jud. i. 6; iii. 20–22; iv. 17 ff.; v. 24 ff.; viii. 16 f.; ix. 5, 49; xii. 6; xviii. 27 f.; xxi. 10 f.; 1 Sam. xxv. 10–13; xxxiv. 39; xxvii. 9 ff.; 2 Sam. iii. 27; viii. 2; xii. 31; 1 Kings ii. 5 f., 8 f.; xi. 15 f.

[6] Jud. ix. 54; xvi. 29 ff.; 1 Sam. xxxi. 4 ff.; 2 Sam. xvii. 23.

[7] Gen. xii. 16 ff.; xx. 3 ff.; xxvi. 10 f.

[8] Jud. iv. 4; Ex. xv. 20; 2 Kings xxii. 14.

Christian ethics as certain modern catechisms would have it. But even taken in its literal sense, it is a wonderful production for the epoch to which it belongs. Its precepts are often elsewhere reproduced in the Old Testament, which clearly proves that we here have to do with the fundamental laws of Israel.

Jehovah after having reminded his people that he is their God, and that he delivered them from bondage in Egypt, forbids them to worship other gods besides him.[1] This is the prime law of the old covenant. The whole Old Testament teaches that the greatest unfaithfulness of which Israel could be guilty was the abandonment of Jehovah, to become a devotee of idolatry. The decalogue forbids, in the second place, the making of images to worship.[2] The profanation of the sacred name of Jehovah by taking a false oath, or any bad use of it whatever, is next prohibited.[3] These three prohibitions are followed by two positive commands: one ordains that the Sabbath, the holiday *par excellence*, be sanctified, kept sacred, apart from other days, and not devoted to manual labor;[4] the other requires that fathers and mothers be honored.[5] The place assigned to this command, immediately after those touching duties to God, shows its importance. The remainder of the decalogue consists merely of a series of prohibitions. The first forbids murder;[6] life, from the Israelitish point of view, being the most precious of blessings. Next to his life man's greatest treasure is his wife.[7] This is the reason why the prohibition of murder is followed by that of adultery.[8] Then comes the prohibition of theft, forbid-

[1] Ex. xx. 2 f. [2] *vv.* 4 f. [3] *v.* 7; see Dillmann. [4] *vv.* 8 ff.
[5] *v.* 12. [6] *v.* 13. [7] Comp. Gen. ii. 23 f. [8] Ex. xx. 14.

ding one to lay one's hand upon the property of a neighbor.[1] But one has no more right to do violence to the life or property of one's neighbor by words than by acts. Hence the prohibition of false testimony, in case of legal proceedings.[2] Finally, since bad words and actions proceed from bad desires, these also are forbidden.[3] For contrary to the supposition of many since Luther's day, reference is here made to covetousness, and not simply to external but indirect means of getting possession of others' goods.[4]

There is good reason for dividing the decalogue into duties of piety, toward God and parents, and duties of probity, toward neighbors. The whole thing is admirably conceived. It begins with the most exalted duties, those toward God, then mentions the duties toward parents, and closes with those toward other men. In this last series the duty toward life, the most precious of blessings, is found at the beginning, as in the first series, the fundamental duty toward God. Life and woman deserve especial mention; the other blessings receive only secondary consideration. There is also in these last an admirable gradation, in that bad actions toward one's neighbor are first prohibited, then bad words, and finally bad desires.

It is not necessary to pass in review all the other laws of document A above mentioned. Each one can make a study of them for himself. Any one who carefully reads all this primitive legislation of Israel will notice that it is very simple; that, like the decalogue, of which it is in part only a development, it enjoins above all the chief duties toward God and one's neigh-

[1] *v.* 15. [2] *v.* 16. [3] *v.* 17. [4] See Dillmann.

bor. The ceremonial laws are here neither numerous nor complicated. It is humanitarian laws that predominate. This legislation goes so far as to enjoin kindness toward enemies;[1] the *lex talionis* that it promulgates[2] is a juridical regulation, and not a rule for the conduct of private life. It also enjoins justice toward the stranger, charity toward the poor, fairness and mildness toward slaves and servants,[3] and even consideration for animals.[4]

## § 6. WORSHIP.

### I. *Places of Worship.*

Primitively there was great freedom in Israel in the matter of places of worship. The oldest documents of the Pentateuch also tell us that the patriarchs reared altars, to sacrifice to God and call upon him, wherever they happened to be.[5] Moses and Joshua followed this custom.[6] In the days of the judges, the children of Israel offer sacrifices at Bokim;[7] Gideon builds an altar to Jehovah at Ophra;[8] he offers a sacrifice on a rock;[9] Manoah does the same;[10] Micah has a private sanctuary.[11] At the same time we find sacred places at

[1] Ex. xxiii. 4 f. [2] Ex. xxi. 23–25.
[3] Ex. xx. 10; xxi. 1–11; xxii. 21–27; xxiii. 6, 9, 11 f.
[4] Ex. xx. 10; xxiii. 11 f.
[5] Gen. viii. 20; xii. 7 f.; xiii. 3 f., 18; xxi. 33; xxii. 9, 13; xxvi. 25; xxviii. 18–22; xxxiii. 20; xxxv. 1–3, 7; xlvi. 1.
[6] Ex. xvii. 15; xviii. 12; xxiv. 4; Deut. xxvii. 4 ff.; Josh. viii. 30 f.; xxiv. 1, 25 f.
[7] Jud. ii. 5. [8] Jud. vi. 24. [9] Jud. vi. 25 ff.
[10] Jud. xiii. 19. [11] Jud. xvii. 5, 10–13.

Mispah,[1] Shiloh,[2] Bethel,[3] and Gibeah.[4] Samuel offers sacrifices indifferently at Mispah, Ramah, Gilgal, and Bethlehem.[5] Saul rears altars and offers sacrifices at various places.[6] From this time until the erection of Solomon's temple, these same sacred places and others serve as sanctuaries for the worship of Jehovah, David and Solomon in this respect following the traditional usage.[7]

In some of the passages cited the places of worship are called *high places*. They were in fact places, naturally or artificially raised, such as are found among Semitic peoples generally.[8] This worship at high-places was continued even after the erection of the temple under the most faithful kings.[9] The prophet Elijah rebuilds the altar on Mount Carmel, and offers sacrifices on it.[10] He complains that numerous altars consecrated to Jehovah in the country have been destroyed.[11] Elisha allows Namaan to carry the soil of Canaan into Syria, for the purpose of rearing there an altar and offering sacrifices to Jehovah.[12] Isaiah expresses the hope that, in the future, the Egyptians will turn to Jehovah and rear an altar to him in their country and offer him sacrifices.[13] It is therefore certain that in Israel a multiplicity of

[1] Jud. xi. 11; xx. 1; xxi. 1, 5, 8; 1 Sam. vii. 5 ff.; x. 17 ff.

[2] Jud. xviii. 31; xxi. 19; 1 Sam. i.–iv.

[3] Jud. xx. 18, 23, 26 f.; xxi. 2, 4; 1 Sam. x. 3. [4] 1 Sam. x. 5.

[5] 1 Sam. vii. 7, 9, 17; ix. 12 f.; x. 8; xi. 14 f.; xvi. 4 f.; comp. xv. 33. [6] 1 Sam. xiii. 9 f.; xiv. 34 f.

[7] 1 Sam. xv. 21; xx. 6, 28 f.; xxi. 1 ff.; xxii. 9 ff.; 2 Sam. v. 3; xv. 7 ff.; xxi. 6, 9; xxiv. 18, 25; 1 Kings i. 9; iii. 2 ff.

[8] Baudissin, II. pp. 232 ff.; [Schultz, I. pp. 206 f.].

[9] 1 Kings xv. 14; xxii. 44; 2 Kings xii. 3; xiv. 4; xv. 4, 34 f.

[10] 1 Kings xviii. 30 ff. [11] 1 Kings xix. 10, 14.

[12] 2 Kings v. 17. [13] Isa. xix. 18 ff.; comp. Zeph. ii. 11.

places of worship was long perfectly lawful, or, as we now say, orthodox, since the most faithful kings and even the prophets gave it their approval. The unfavorable criticism on this subject that we find in the books of Kings and Chronicles should not lead us astray: this criticism is, as we shall see, made from a later point of view. The freedom to establish places of worship at different points at the same time, is hallowed even by the oldest legislation, for in it Jehovah is made to say that wherever his name is invoked, altars of rough stone should be reared that sacrifices may be offered to him.[1] The attempt has been made to bring this ordinance into harmony with the later legislation, which requires absolute centralization of worship, by maintaining that, in the passage quoted, reference is made to the various places where the portable sanctuary and its altar, of which this legislation speaks, may from time to time be established. But this altar is of wood, ornamented with brass;[2] while our passage speaks of an altar of stones and allows such an altar to be reared in several places at the same time. The best commentary on this text is the custom, that, as we have shown, existed in Israel until toward the Exile. It is clearly this ancient usage, and not the centralization of worship, first required by Deuteronomy, that is most in harmony with the spirit of Mosaism. The primitive liberty respecting places of worship was, moreover, very natural and legitimate, since it corresponded to a real religious need. Ewald has with some justice connected Ex. xx. 24 f., which hallows this ancient usage, with the promise of the

[1] Ex. xx. 24 f. [2] Ex. xxvii. 1 f.; xxxviii. 30; xxxix. 39.

gospel: "Where two or three are gathered in my name, I will be in the midst of them." [1]

The absolute centralization of worship that was legally sanctioned in the period following, nevertheless has its roots in the earliest history of Israel. According to document A, there was, even in the desert, a central tabernacle.[2] It was a tent that sheltered the ark of the covenant, whose existence since this date is proven by the same document.[3] In the days of the judges we find the ark at Bethel and Shiloh.[4] In serious wars the Israelites carried it about in their camp, that Jehovah, being present in the midst of the army, might the better lend them his assistance.[5] Wherever the ark happened to be, sacrifices might be offered to Jehovah.[6] Before it prayer was made to God.[7] When David wished to establish a national sanctuary at Jerusalem, he felt the necessity of transporting thither the sacred ark,[8] and the temple of Solomon itself acquired a sacred and national character only through its presence.[9] The above discussion, then, shows that from the time of Moses the ark of the covenant served as a rallying point for all Israel. The later codes were able to find support in this fact for presenting the centralization of worship as Mosaic.

[1] *Antiquities of Israel*, p. 121.
[2] Ex. xxxiii. 7 ff.; xxxiv. 34 f.; Num. xii. 5, 10.
[3] Num. x. 33–36; xiv. 44; Deut. x. 8; Josh. iii. f.; vi.; vii. 6.
[4] Jud. xx. 26 f.; 1 Sam. iii. 3; iv. 3 f.
[5] 1 Sam. iv.; xiv. 18; 2 Sam. xi. 11; Com. xv. 24.
[6] 1 Sam. vi. 14 ff.; 2 Sam. vi. 13, 17; 1 Kings viii. 5.
[7] Josh. vii. 6 ff. [8] 2 Sam. vi.
[9] 1 Kings viii. 1 ff.

## II. *The Priesthood.*

The same freedom that originally existed with reference to places of worship, existed also with reference to the priesthood. Let us see what early Hebrew literature teaches us on this point.

According to document A, among the first men and in the days of the patriarchs, it is the father of the family who exercises the functions of a priest.[1] Moses also fulfils these functions.[2] In offering sacrifices, at the time of the establishment of the covenant with Jehovah, he calls to his assistance young men chosen from among the children of Israel,[3] and probably from all the tribes. This freedom of usage continued. Gideon and Manoah offer sacrifices to Jehovah,[4] and Saul does likewise.[5] When David has the sacred ark transported to Jerusalem, he wears the sacerdotal costume, offers sacrifices, and blesses the people.[6] Solomon also fulfils sacerdotal functions,[7] likewise the prophet Elijah.[8] Jeroboam and Ahaz, therefore, in assuming them in their turn,[9] do nothing unlawful from the traditional point of view. The editor of the books of Kings finds fault with them because he takes the later standpoint of the legislation of Deuteronomy, which, as we shall see farther on, condemns any but a Levitical priesthood.

[1] Gen. iv. 3 f.; viii. 20; xii. 7 f.; xiii. 4, 18; xv. 9; xxii. 1 ff.; xxvi. 25; xxxv. 1 ff.; xlvi. 1.

[2] Ex. xxiv. 6–8; comp. xvii. 15.

[3] Ex. xxiv. 4 f.

[4] Jud. vi. 20 ff.; xiii. 16 ff.

[5] 1 Sam. xiii. 9 ff.; comp. xiv. 34 f.

[6] 2 Sam. vi.

[7] 1 Kings iii. 4; viii. 14, 54 ff., 62 ff.; ix. 25; x. 5.

[8] 1 Kings xviii. 22 ff., 30 ff.

[9] 1 Kings xii. 32–xiii. 1 ff.; 2 Kings xvi. 12 f.

The universal priesthood, however, is not merely a matter of practice at the beginning, in Israel. In a passage from document A it is represented as the normal institution. In fact, we read, Ex. xix. 6, that when he established his covenant with the children of Israel, Jehovah caused it to be said to them: "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." All Israelites, therefore, were to be servants consecrated to Jehovah, having free access to his presence.[1] Nevertheless, priests early make their appearance in Israel as among all other peoples of antiquity. But originally the priesthood does not form a separate cast, is not the prerogative of a single family. Document A speaks of Melchisedek, a priest of the most-high God, whose authority was recognized by Abraham;[2] of Jethro, the priest of Midian, whose claim to the office is allowed by Aaron and the elders of Israel;[3] and of Israelitish priests.[4] Did these last belong to the tribe of Levi? There is no indication to this effect. On the contrary, it must be observed that the Pentateuchal documents which speak of the institution of the Levitical priesthood place this ceremony later. In the book of Judges, an Ephraimite consecrates his son to be priest in his own private sanctuary.[5] He afterwards, when the occasion presents itself, replaces him by a Levite, whom he himself also consecrates for his sacerdotal functions;[6] but this Levite does not belong to the sacred tribe; he is a Levite only by virtue of his functions, since the statement is expressly made that he was of the family

[1] See Dillmann, *l.l.*
[2] Gen. xiv. 18-20.
[3] Ex. ii. 16; iii. 1; xviii. 12.
[4] Ex. xix. 22, 24.
[5] xvii. 1-5.
[6] *vv.* 10, 12 f.

of Judah.[1] When the sacred ark is brought back from the country of the Philistines and deposited at Kirjath-jearim, in the house of Abinadab, the people of the place consecrate the son of this latter to guard it.[2] Samuel is devoted from his infancy to the service of the sanctuary,[3] and he later fulfils the functions of a priest,[4] although he belongs neither to a sacerdotal family nor to the tribe of Levi,[5] as was finally claimed for the sake of justifying his priestly acts from the later standpoint.[6] We find other priests who are not Levites: a Jairite,[7] a son of Nathan the prophet,[8] even sons of David.[9] There are, it is true, translators who, in the last three cases, change the priests into officers or ministers of state, but this is an error. When, therefore, Jeroboam ordained priests who were not Levites,[10] he simply followed ancient custom, sanctioned by the most faithful theocrats.

Although, at first, every Israelite might become a priest of Jehovah, we early perceive a tendency to prefer as priests members of the tribe of Levi. Document A itself relates that the sons of Levi were consecrated in a special manner to the service of Jehovah by the massacre which, at Moses' command, they wrought among the Israelites who had worshipped the golden calf.[11] According to another passage of the same document, which, however, is evidently borrowed from a different source, the tribe of Levi was not set apart for

[1] Jud. xvii. 7. [2] 1 Sam. vii. 1. [3] 1 Sam. i. ff.
[4] 1 Sam. vii. 9 f.; ix. 12 f.; x. 8; xvi. 5. [5] 1 Sam. i. 1; ii. 19.
[6] 1 Chr. vi. 28, 33.
[7] 2 Sam. xx. 26; comp. Num. xxxii. 41; Deut. iii. 14; Jud. x. 3 ff.
[8] 1 Kings iv. 5. [9] 2 Sam. viii. 18.
[10] 1 Kings xii. 31; xiii. 33; comp. 2 Kings xvii. 32.
[11] Ex. xxxii. 26–29; comp. Gen. xxxiv. 25 f.

the service of Jehovah until after the death of Aaron.[1] The old song, Gen. xlix., it is true, does not speak very favorably of Levi,[2] probably because it was composed at a date before the tribe of Levi played an important part; but another song, of a more recent date, though relatively ancient, speaks favorably of this tribe, and expressly connects it with the priesthood,[3] as does also 1 Sam. ii. 27 ff. From the time of the judges we see Levites, but more particularly descendants of Moses and Aaron, exercising sacerdotal functions at certain sanctuaries.[4] It appears from 1 Sam. ii. 27 ff. that the priest Eli belonged to the tribe of Levi. We see, moreover, that the priest Ahijah, who was in Saul's train,[5] the numerous sacerdotal family of Nob,[6] Abiathar and Zadok, the chief priests of David,[7] were descended from Eli through Ahitub,[8] and that, consequently, they were all of the tribe of Levi. Since Solomon, though he dismissed Abiathar,[9] retained Zadok in his office,[10] and the descendants of this latter still held the priesthood in Jerusalem at the time of the Exile, it may be admitted that, beginning with David, it was the Levites who chiefly occupied the priesthood at Jerusalem. There are, however, those who deny that Zadok was a descendant of Eli and therefore of Aaron and Levi.[11]

[1] Deut. x. 6–9. [2] Gen. xlix. 5 ff. [3] Deut. xxxiii. 8–11.
[4] Jud. xviii. 30 f.; xx 26–28. [5] 1 Sam. xiv. 18.
[6] 1 Sam. xxi. 1 ff.; xxii. 9 ff.
[7] 2 Sam. viii. 17; xv. 24 ff., 35 f.; xvii. 15; xix. 11 ff.; xx. 25; 1 Kings i. 7 ff.
[8] 1 Sam. xiv. 3; xxii. 20; 2 Sam. viii. 17. [9] 1 Kings ii. 26 f.
[10] 1 Kings ii. 35. [11] Vatke, pp. 344 f.; Wellhausen, pp. 125 f.

### III. *Religious Festivals.*

1. *The Sabbath.* — There is a passage in document A that presupposes the existence of the Sabbath before the promulgation of the law.[1] The oldest legislation and even the decalogue itself enjoin the observance of it.[2] The Sabbath is perhaps the earliest holiday of the Hebrews. At any rate it was of ancient origin, and it always remained the holiday *par excellence*. Reuss says on this subject: "The notion of the week with its holiday doubtless dates from the remotest antiquity. We no longer hesitate to recognize its astronomic origin, that is, to connect it with what the ancient peoples called the seven planets."[3] Dillmann expresses himself to the same purpose. He thinks, however, with others, that the four phases of the moon must have given origin to the week;[4] which Reuss finds not impossible, but improbable, "in view of the actual duration of the astronomic month, which is twenty-nine and a half days."

This primitive character of the Sabbath, however, no longer appears in Hebrew literature. According to the whole Old Testament the Sabbath is essentially a day of rest. This is clearly expressed in the various codes of the Pentateuch, including the oldest,[5] and it harmonizes with the word *Sabbath*, which means rest. Still the Sabbath cannot have received this significance until the Israelites ceased to be nomadic shepherds, to become

[1] Ex. xvi. 27–30. [2] Ex. xx. 8 ff. ; xxiii. 12 ; xxxiv. 21.

[3] *Histoire Sainte*, I. p. 121 ; comp. *Gesch.* § 71 ; [Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament* (KAT) on Gen. ii. 3.

[4] See on Ex. xx. 8 ff.

[5] Ex. xx. 10 ; xxiii. 12 ; xxxiv. 21 ; xxi. 13 ff. ; Deut. v. 14.

an agricultural people. For "the shepherd knows no Sabbath in this sense, although it was doubtless he who first observed the heavens and distinguished the fixed stars from the planets. His flock needs care and food, and must be led to water one day as well as another; his kind of occupation is the same the year through. The requirement of absolute rest does not date from the time when the Israelites were nomads."[1]

What the ancient documents emphasize most is the humanitarian side of the Sabbath. Its chief end is to provide rest for slaves and domestic animals.[2] Even in Deuteronomy we find the same point of view. The Sabbath is there connected with the memory of the deliverance from slavery in Egypt; but the thought of the Deuteronomist is evidently this: Israel should remember that they were slaves in Egypt and that Jehovah delivered them, that they may, on this day, give rest to their slaves as well as themselves.[3]

2. *The New Moon.* — The first of the [lunar] month seems to have been a holiday in Israel from remote antiquity. We see that every new moon Saul invited his principal servants to his table.[4] These repasts evidently had a religious character, since Levitical impurity might exclude one from them.[5] We see, moreover, that even in the old prophets, and always afterward, the new moon is placed upon the same level with the Sabbath and other festivals.[6]

[1] Reuss, *Histoire Sainte*, I. p. 122 ; [Schultz, I. p. 205].

[2] Ex. xxiii. 10 ; xxxiv. 21 ; comp. xx. 10.

[3] Deut. v. 14 f. ; comp. xv. 15.

[4] 1 Sam. xx. 5, 18, 24.

[5] 1 Sam. xx. 26.

[6] Amos viii. 5 ; Hos. ii. 11 ; Isa. i. 13 f. ; Ezek. xlv. 17 ; xlvi. 1, 3 ; Isa. lxvi. 23 ; 2 Kings iv. 23, etc.

The festival of the new moon is evidently an astronomic one. The Israelites were not able to stamp it with a theocratic character, as they did the other festivals originally borrowed from nature. The ancient codes say nothing at all about it. As this festival, however, existed in Israel from a very remote date, it is probable that it, like other religious acts and institutions, rests solely on the usage of antiquity in general; for the new moon was celebrated among many other peoples by a great festival.[1]

In Israel the new moons were days of rest,[2] when the people assembled at the sanctuary,[3] and when they preferred to go to consult the prophets.[4] This explains why the discourses of the prophets were sometimes inspired and delivered on these days.[5]

3. *The Three Pilgrim Feasts.* — Document A enjoins the celebration of three annual feasts, the feast of passover, or unleavened bread, that of weeks, or the first-fruits of the harvest, and that of the vintage at the end of the year; they are also called pilgrim feasts, because, for each of them, every male Israelite must betake himself to the sanctuary to present himself before Jehovah.[6] It was on the occasion of these solemnities that Solomon offered sacrifices three times a year to God.[7] It was probably also one of these feasts to which the father of Samuel went up to Shiloh every year to worship Jeho-

[1] Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexikon*, IV. p. 322; Riehm's *Handwörterbuch*, pp. 431, 1077; [Ewald, *Antiquities*, pp. 349 f.].

[2] Amos viii. 5. [3] Isa. i. 13 f.; Ezek. xlvi. 1, 3; Isa. lxvi. 23.

[4] 2 Kings iv. 23.

[5] Ezek. xxvi. 1; xxix. 17; xxxi. 1; xxxii. 1; Hag. i. 1.

[6] Ex. xxiii. 14–17; xxxiv. 18, 22–24.

[7] 1 Kings ix. 25; comp. 2 Chron. viii. 13.

vah and offer him sacrifices,[1] and at which the family of David sacrificed in Bethlehem.[2] It appears from other passages that, from remote antiquity, the Israelites made a practice of celebrating feasts in honor of Jehovah, which seem to have been chiefly days of popular rejoicing.[3] Deuteronomy, like document A, mentions the three pilgrim feasts in the same connection.[4]

*a. The Festival of Passover and Unleavened Bread*, in the Old Testament represented as a single festival, is certainly a union of two distinct feasts, an agricultural and a theocratic. It is even very probable that originally this feast also had an astronomical significance, that it was the spring festival found among most of the peoples of antiquity.[5] There is no longer any trace of this last feature of the feast of passover in Hebrew literature, but its agricultural significance appears in some passages, especially Lev. xxiii. 9–14. Here the offering of the first-fruits of the harvest is combined with the passover, and this offering is represented as intimately related to the feast to be celebrated seven weeks later, at the end of the harvest. This connection between the two feasts also crops out, Deut. xvi. 9, where it is apparent that the former coincides with the time when the sickle is put into the harvest. The custom of eating unleavened bread seven days, which gave

[1] 1 Sam. i. 3, 7, 21. [2] 1 Sam. xx. 6, 29.

[3] Ex. v. 1; x. 9; xxxii. 5 f., 19; Jud. xxi. 19 ff.; 1 Kings xii. 32 f.; Amos v. 21; viii. 10; Hos. ii. 11; ix. 5; Isa. i. 14; xxix. 1; xxx. 29; xxxiii. 20. [4] Chapter xvi.

[5] Dillmann, *Bibel-Lexikon*, II. p. 269; also *Exodus u. Leviticus*, p. 581; *Handwörterbuch*, pp. 431 f., 1139 f.; Reuss, *Histoire Sainte*, I. p. 164; also on Ex. xii. 2, and *Gesch.*, §§ 58, 289; [Ewald, *Antiquities*, pp. 358 ff.].

its name to the feast, as it is found in the oldest legal passages,[1] seems also to have sprung from the connection of this feast with the commencement of the harvest.[2]

The feast of unleavened bread is combined with the feast of passover; but, in all our documents, the agricultural character of the former is almost entirely eclipsed by the theocratic character of the latter. The term *pesach*, which we render passover, means *passage*. Even document A is acquainted with it.[3] It declares that the passover is celebrated in honor of Jehovah, who passed over the dwellings of the children of Israel, and spared them when he smote Egypt.[4] This explanation is reproduced in document C.[5] Document A itself unites the feast of passover with the feast of unleavened bread, saying that the Israelites had to leave Egypt in so hurried a manner that they were obliged to take their dough before it was leavened and make cakes of it at the first stopping-place.[6] This explanation is not natural. We learn, moreover, from Ex. xii. 8 (document C), that Moses gave orders beforehand to eat the passover with unleavened bread. We must, therefore, seek the reason for this custom in the agricultural character of the feast, or admit that fermentation was regarded by the Israelites as something impure.[7] In the latter case, the urgent injunction not to use leaven during the continuance of the feast would be perfectly explained,[8]

[1] Ex. xxiii. 15; xxxiv. 18.

[2] Dillmann on Ex. xii. 20; also *Bibel-Lexikon*, IV. p. 387 ff.; [Wellhausen, pp. 89 f.].

[3] Ex. xxxiv. 25. [4] Ex. xii. 27. [5] Ex. xii. 11–13.

[6] Ex. xii. 34, 39; comp. Deut. xvi. 3.

[7] Lev. ii. 4 f., 11 f.; comp. Oehler, § 124.

[8] Ex. xii 15, 19; xiii. 7; Deut. xvi. 4.

as well as the strict prohibition against offering the blood of the sacrifice with fermented bread.[1] It doubtless contributed to the identification of the two feasts that all the documents of the Pentateuch place the exodus from Egypt in the first month of the year, the month of ears,[2] in which occurred the feast of the commencement of the harvest and the feast of the springtime.[3]

Document A commands the celebration of this double feast every year, for the purpose of perpetuating the memory of the exodus from Egypt, by eating unleavened bread seven days, and, on the seventh day, observing a special festival in honor of Jehovah.[4] It also enjoins that every male Israelite present himself before God with sacrifices, among which that of the passover occupies the first rank.[5] If Ex. xxiii. 19 and xxxiv. 26 are to be closely connected with the verses preceding, if these passages mean that at the feast of the passover the first-fruits of the land must be brought to the sanctuary, as appears from Lev. xxiii. 9 ff., this is a new proof of the agricultural character of this feast.

Deuteronomy agrees with these injunctions in their essential features; but it gives them greater precision, ordaining that large and small cattle be offered in the evening, from the beginning of the feast, in sacrifice to Jehovah, and that the flesh be cooked and eaten; it insists, and this is peculiar to it, that the sacrifice of the passover can be offered and eaten only at the place where

[1] Ex. xxiii. 18; xxxiv. 25.
[2] Ex. xii. 1; xiii. 4; xxiii. 15; xxxiv. 18; Deut. xvi. 1.
[3] Dillmann, *l.l.*
[4] Ex. xiii. 3–10.
[5] Ex. xii. 27; xxxiv. 23–25; xxiii. 15, 17 f.

the lawful sanctuary is located.[1] This code must have introduced certain innovations. Under its influence, in fact, King Josiah caused the passover to be kept as it had never before been celebrated.[2] According to Professor Reuss the passover had hitherto been the spring festival and then only took a theocratic character.[3] But since even document A gives the feast this character in a number of passages, we cannot admit such a view. It must, moreover, be observed that the deliverance from slavery in Egypt, even in old documents, such as the song of deliverance, Ex. xv., and the decalogue, appears as the chief of the benefits bestowed by Jehovah upon Israel. It is, therefore, inadmissible to suppose that they waited until the time of Josiah to celebrate this blessing; it must have been celebrated from early times, and that in the spring, in the month of ears, together with the feast of unleavened bread, as document A says in several places. The important modifications that the strict centralization of worship necessarily occasioned in the celebration of the passover under Josiah sufficiently explain the statement of the second book of Kings, to which reference has just been made, and on which Professor Reuss bases his view.

Inquiring now into the real significance of this feast, we must take account of its twofold character. The feast of unleavened bread, considered as a feast inaugurating the harvest, in which the first-fruits of the land are offered to God, has the same significance as analogous festivals among the other peoples. Offerings

[1] Deut. xvi. 1–8.

[2] 2 Kings xxiii. 21–23.

[3] See Reuss on this passage; *Histoire Sainte*, I. pp. 164 f., and *Geschichte*, § 289; [Wellhausen, p. 93].

were presented to the divinity at the beginning of the harvest, to express this thought, that the first-fruits of the year should be consecrated to the giver of all things, and that man can properly enjoy his blessings only when this has been done.[1]

As for the feast of passover, it is a commemoration of the deliverance from slavery in Egypt and the foundation of the Israelitish nation, as well as of their covenant with Jehovah; for, according to the Old Testament, Israel forms a nation and becomes the people of Jehovah first from this moment. In order to awaken and maintain the feeling of gratitude toward God, fathers must at each feast remind their sons of this great and memorable token of Jehovah's goodness.[2]

*b. The Feast of the Harvest* is also called *the feast of weeks*, because just seven weeks are to be counted after the feast of the passover in fixing its date.[3] According to Lev. xxiii. 10, the first-fruits of the harvest to be offered at the passover can only be the first-fruits of the barley harvest.[4] It is the first-fruits of the wheat harvest,[5] which comes later, that belong to the feast of weeks. For this harvest, therefore, the feast of weeks is the feast of first-fruits.[6]

This feast is reckoned among the pilgrim feasts at which every male Israelite must present himself before Jehovah.[7] It is closely related to the agricultural feast of unleavened bread, as clearly appears from Lev. xxiii. It is the feast of the close of the harvest, as the feast of

[1] Dillmann on Lev. xxiii. 10 and 14.
[2] Ex. xii. 26 f.; xiii. 8 f.
[3] Ex. xxiii. 16; xxxiv. 22; Deut. xvi. 9 f.; Lev. xxiii. 15 f.
[4] Dillmann on Lev. xxiii. 10. [5] Ex. xxxiv. 22.
[6] Ex. xxiii. 16. [7] Ex. xxiii. 17; xxxiv. 23; Deut. xvi. 16.

unleavened bread is the feast of the commencement.[1] It lasts only one day.[2]

Touching this feast, Deuteronomy is content with saying that the offerings must be voluntary and proportionate to the blessings that each has received from God;[3] that it must be a joyful feast, celebrated at the sanctuary by the whole family, including the servants, to whom must be added the Levites, the strangers, the orphans, and the widows who are in Israel;[4] that such kindness must be displayed because Israel were slaves in Egypt, and Jehovah delivered them.[5]

This feast, like that of unleavened bread, is evidently a feast of thanksgiving; it is intended to express gratitude toward God for the harvest. Among the early Israelites it always had a purely agricultural character. It was not until a later date that the Jews, wishing to give it a theocratic character, made it commemorative of the promulgation of the law.

*c. The Feast of Tabernacles* is the third pilgrim feast. Document A, however, does not give it the name feast of tabernacles, as does Deuteronomy.[6] It speaks simply of the feast of the harvest, which is to be celebrated at the end of the year, when the Israelites gather from the fields the fruits of their labor.[7] To this feast, as a feast of tabernacles, allusion is evidently made, Hos. xii. 9, where feast-days are mentioned on which it is customary to live in tents. The feast of Jehovah, spoken of, Jud. xxi. 19 ff., which was celebrated every year at

[1] *Bibel-Lexikon*, II. p. 269; IV. p. 512; *Handwörterbuch*, p. 433; [Wellhausen, pp. 85 f.].
[2] Lev. xxiii. 21; Num. xxviii. 26.
[3] xvi. 10.
[4] xvi. 11.
[5] xvi. 12; comp. v. 15; xv. 15.
[6] Deut. xvi. 13 ff.
[7] Ex. xxiii. 16; xxxiv. 22.

Shiloh, and at which the young girls engaged in dancing, is also probably the feast of tabernacles.

Even in early times this feast was celebrated seven days in the seventh month, and it was called simply *the feast* because it was the feast *par excellence*.[1] Thus it appears, also, Zech. xiv. 16–19, and Ezek. xlv. 25. Jeroboam transferred it to the following month for the kingdom of the ten tribes,[2] probably because, in the north of Palestine, the vintage and the harvest of the autumnal fruits occurred later than in the South.

According to Deuteronomy this feast must be celebrated in honor of Jehovah, at his sanctuary, at the time when the products of the threshing-floor and the wine-press are gathered; it must be a joyful festival, in which everybody, including the Levites and the poor, are to take part; the offerings to Jehovah are to be proportionate to the blessings that each has received.[3] The significance of this feast is very clear. Celebrated at the beginning of autumn, when the vintage occurred, and the latest products of the soil and the latest fruits of the trees were gathered, it was the general and principal feast of the harvests of the entire year, a feast essentially agricultural, a feast of joy and gratitude toward God, the author of nature and the dispenser of temporal blessings. The custom of celebrating this feast under booths of leafy branches was certainly, in the beginning, intimately related to its rural character.

[1] 1 Kings viii. 2, 65. [2] 1 Kings xii. 32 f. [3] Deut. xvi. 13–17.

## IV. *Religious Rites.*

1. *Circumcision.* — Circumcision, the initial rite of the old covenant,[1] is not an exclusively Israelitish custom; it is found among many peoples, ancient and modern.[2] According to document A this sacred custom existed in the family of Israel from remote antiquity. In the days of Moses and Joshua a stone knife was used for the purpose,[3] which seems to indicate that it originated as early as the stone age.[4] The oldest historical books teach us that the Israelites, when they wished to cast upon their enemies, and particularly the Philistines, a stinging reproach, called them the uncircumcised.[5] Document C, which is generally very theoretical, manifests the same tendency with reference to circumcision. Not content with representing this as an old and sacred custom, it makes it a divine ordinance, dating from Abraham; it represents it as the perpetual sign of the covenant with God; it says that every one who is uncircumcised must be exterminated from the midst of the Hebrews, that even slaves must be circumcised, and that all male children are to be on the eighth day after their birth.[6] It teaches also that in exceptional cases circumcision might be performed at any age,[7] and that a stranger could not partake of the passover without being circumcised.[8]

[1] Lev. xii. 3; Gen. xvii. 10 ff., 23 ff.; xxi. 4.

[2] *Bibel-Lexikon,* I. pp. 405 f.; [Smith, *Dictionary*, art. *Circumcision*]. [3] Gen. xxxiv. 14 ff.; Ex. iv. 24–26; Josh. v. 2–8.

[4] Dillmann on Ex. iv. 25.

[5] Jud. xiv. 3; xv. 18; 1 Sam. xiv. 6; xvii. 26, 36; xxxi. 4; 2 Sam. i. 20. [6] Gen. xvii. 10–14; xxi. 4; Lev. xii. 3.

[7] Gen. xvii. 23–27; comp. xxxiv. 24. [8] Ex. xii. 44, 48.

What is the real significance of this sacrament? There are various opinions on the subject. It is certain that circumcision is an act of consecration to Jehovah.[1] Thereby every male Israelite is incorporated with the chosen people and obtains the privileges that are connected with the covenant with Jehovah. Some modern theologians, starting from Ex. iv. 24–26, profess to see in it, above all, a bloody sacrifice, performed at the very source of life, by which the life of every Israelite is, from his youth, consecrated to God; and they maintain that circumcision is only secondarily and as a consequence of this significance, the sign of the covenant with Jehovah.[2] Others combat the idea that circumcision is a sacrifice; they see in it an act of purification and therefore of consecration to God.[3] Steiner adopts a combination of both views,[4] which are really mutually exclusive.

It is certain that, according to the old passage Ex. iv. 24–26, "circumcision is a sacramental act, in which the blood of the child redeems the life of the father, a symbolic sort of sacrifice which insures divine favor,"[5] and that, by this act, the circumcised child is at the same time consecrated to God.[6] But in a number of other passages — of a later date, it is true — circumcision is also the symbol of purity or purification. There are references to circumcised hearts, *i.e.* regenerate, pure, obedient hearts; and to uncircumcised hearts, *i.e.* hearts that are impure and rebellious toward God.[7] An inat-

[1] Reuss, *Gesch.*, § 71; [Ewald, *Antiquities*, pp. 92 f.].
[2] Dillmann on Ex. iv. 26 and Lev. xii. 3.
[3] *Handwörterbuch*, p. 170; Oehler, § 88.
[4] *Bibel-Lexikon*, I. pp. 408 f. [5] Reuss, *i.l.* [6] Dillmann, *i.l.*
[7] Lev. xxvi. 41; Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6; Jer. iv. 4; ix. 26; Ezek. xliv. 7.

tentive ear, one that will not hear the word of Jehovah, is an uncircumcised ear.[1] The first-fruits of trees are considered uncircumcised, *i.e.* as impure, and not to be eaten.[2]

Inasmuch as circumcision was an act of consecration to Jehovah, it was necessarily an act of purification and sanctification, since nothing could be consecrated without being purified and sanctified. Israel must be a holy people, and one could become part of this people only by circumcision: the idea of sanctification was therefore inseparable from this ceremony. Dillmann maintains that if circumcision had been an act of purification, there must have been an analogous purification for the female child.[3] But this argument is weak. The Israelitish woman played a very subordinate part even in matters of religion. She belonged to the people of God, by virtue of being the daughter, the wife, or the slave of the head of a family; she had no need of being otherwise incorporated with it.[4]

2. *Sacrifices.* — The most important religious act, the essential part of worship among almost all the peoples of antiquity, and not less so among the Israelites, is sacrifice. The custom of offering sacrifices seems to be of as ancient a date as religion itself. It suggested itself very naturally to the primitive man, with his exceedingly infantile notions respecting the Deity. At first the gods were supposed to have all the needs and desires of men. To secure their favor, to appease their wrath, or to manifest gratitude to them, presents were brought and sacrifices offered to them. This

[1] Jer. vi. 10. [2] Lev. xix. 23. [3] See on Lev. xii. 3.
[4] *Handwörterbuch*, p. 168; Oehler, § 88.

means was considered more efficacious than simple prayer.

The practice of offering sacrifices certainly existed among the Hebrews from times the most remote. Document A represents it as dating from the first man.[1] The same authority testifies to its existence in the days of the patriarchs,[2] as well as in those of Moses and Joshua.[3] The oldest of the other historical books give evidence of its continued existence.[4] But it must be observed that the legal portion of document A knows nothing of either an institution or a regulation of sacrifices. Traditional usage seems originally to have sufficed on this as on so many other points.

It clearly follows from the passages cited, and many others, that, in ancient times, the rite did not play the part that it did afterwards; for it is nowhere dwelt upon. The important thing was not the rite, which, in an age when primitive simplicity and freedom reigned, was probably not strictly uniform.[5] The important thing was that the sacrifices be offered to Jehovah and not to other gods.[6]

Among all peoples sacrifices are essentially offerings, gifts made to the divinity by his worshippers. It was the same in Israel. This is expressed by the term

[1] Gen. iv. 3 f.; viii. 20.

[2] Gen. xv. 9 ff.; xxii. 2 ff., 13; xxxi. 54; xlvi. 1.

[3] Ex. v. 3; x. 25 f.; xviii. 12; xx. 24; xxii. 20; xxiv. 5; xxxii. 6; xxxiv. 25; Num. xxv. 2; Josh. xxii. 23, 26–29.

[4] Jud. ii. 5; vi. 19–21, 25–28; xi. 31; xiii. 16, 19; xx. 26; xxi. 4; 1 Sam. i. 3, 21, 24 f.; ii. 13 ff., 28 f.; iii. 14; vii. 9 f.; ix. 13; x. 8; xi. 15; xiii. 9 f.; xv. 15, 22; xvi. 2 ff.; xx. 6, 29; xxvi. 19; etc.

[5] Jud. vi. 19 f.; xi. 30 f.; xiii. 15, 19; 1 Sam. vi. 14; 2 Sam. vi. 13; 1 Kings viii. 30 ff.; xix. 19–21.

[6] Ex. xxii. 20.

*minchah*, offering, which was originally applied to sacrifices in general,[1] and not to bloodless sacrifices alone, as the later legislation would lead one to suppose.[2] Since in document A it denotes especially bloodless sacrifices, we find there and in Ezekiel another term for sacrifices in general, viz. *qorban*, which also means offering, present.[3]

Sacrifices have the same object as any other offering made to Jehovah, — to obtain or retain his favors, or to render thanks for favors obtained. But what distinguishes the sacrifice from other offerings is that it is offered and partly or wholly burned on the altar, the table of Jehovah, and that it is thought to serve as food for God. In fact, only things that are edible are offered to him, — and those the best both of fruits of the earth and domestic, or, in biblical phraseology, clean, animals.[4] Sacrifices are actually called the food of God,[5] and said to have an odor pleasant to him.[6] Libations of wine were added[7] because man does not usually eat without drinking. Since, also, perfumes were esteemed and freely used on grand occasions, they were burned on the altars of Jehovah,[8] after the fashion followed elsewhere.[9]

[1] Gen. iv. 3–5; Num. xvi. 15; Jud. vi. 18 f.; 1 Sam. ii. 17; xxvi. 19; Isa. i. 13; Mal. i. 10–13; ii. 12 f.; iii. 3 f. [2] Lev. ii.

[3] Lev. i. 2 ff.; ii. 1 ff.; iii. i ff.; iv. 23, 28, 32; v. 11, etc.; Ezek. xx. 28; xl.; xl. 43.

[4] Gen. iv. 3 f.; viii. 20; 1 Sam. xv. 15; Lev. xxii. 20 ff.; Mal. i. 8, 14.

[5] Lev. iii. 11, 16; xxi. 6, 8, 17, 21 f.; etc.

[6] Gen. viii. 21; Ex. xxix. 18, 25, 41; Lev. i. 9, 13, 17; ii. 2, 9, 12; etc. [7] Hos. ix. 4; Num. xv. 5 ff.; xxviii. 7 ff.

[8] Isa. i. 13; Jer. xxxiii. 18; xli. 5; 1 Kings iii. 3; ix. 25; xiii. 1; Ex. xxx. 7 f., 34–38; Lev. ii. 1, 15; xvi. 12 f.

[9] Dillmann on Ex. xxx. 34–38.

The original ground for sacrifices, then, is the thought that the Deity takes nourishment; in fine, has human needs. But with the progress of religious ideas in Israel this custom took on a more enlightened character; so that it could be preserved even when a purer conception of the Deity became prevalent. He who presented an offering to Jehovah made a sacrifice, renounced some good in favor of God; but he connected with this act a religious thought, a feeling, a desire, a vow: the offering was, so to speak, the vehicle for them, the means of presenting them to God. It was a thought, a feeling of adoration or thankfulness for blessings received, or perhaps a prayer, a vow, that new benefits might be obtained. Sacrifices thus also denoted the covenant relations that Israel enjoyed with Jehovah; were the means of maintaining this covenant, or restoring it when it had been violated by any infidelity.[1]

The Israelites, in imitation of the idolatrous peoples about them, sometimes sacrificed their children to Baal and Moloch.[2] In early times such sacrifices might also be made to Jehovah, as is proven by the case of Jephthah's daughter, offered as a burnt sacrifice by her father.[3] It was Jehovah before whom King Agag was slain by Samuel,[4] and seven sons of Saul, devoted to this purpose by David, were hanged.[5] The story in Genesis, representing God as interfering to prevent Abraham from offering his son Isaac as a burnt sacrifice, was certainly intended to show that Jehovah does

[1] De Wette, *Archeologie*, § 200; Dillmann, *Exodus u. Leviticus*, pp. 376 f.; [Ewald, *Antiquities*, pp. 23 ff.].

[2] Jer. vii. 31; xix. 5; xxxii. 35; Ezek. xvi. 20 f.; 2 Kings xvi. 3; xvii. 17; xxiii. 10; comp. Lev. xviii. 21; xx. 2 ff.

[3] Jud. xi. 30 f., 34–39. [4] 1 Sam. xv. 33. [5] 2 Sam. xxi. 6.

not accept sacrifices of this sort. Such a lesson could only be necessary if the early Hebrews sacrificed their children to God, as was the practice among other Semitic peoples.

It was first-born sons who were the favorite offerings,[1] because they, like the first-born of the flocks and herds, were believed to belong more especially to the Deity.[2]

3. *The Offering of the First-born, First-fruits, and Tithes.* — As distinct and regular offerings the Israelites had to give to Jehovah the first-born, the first-fruits of the land, and tithes, as appears even from document A.[3] From the time when human sacrifices were forbidden in Israel the first-born of men had to be redeemed.[4]

Offerings of the same kind were made among other peoples. The reason is easily comprehended. There was a strong conviction that all blessings come from the Deity, and that they could not lawfully be enjoyed until after a part had been rendered to him as a token of gratitude. First-fruits were offered, because the claims of the Deity take priority over those of men, because first-fruits are generally the best that one has, and because, as the earliest products, they represent all that follow. Tithes were offered, because, according to a very widely recognized symbolism, the number ten was regarded as a perfect number, representing totality. In Israel, moreover, Jehovah was considered the proprietor of the soil and the king of the country, so that these offerings

[1] Mic. vi. 7 ; Ezek. xx. 26.

[2] Ex. xxii. 29 f. ; xxxiv. 19 f. ; Num. xviii. 15.

[3] Gen. xiv. 20 ; xxviii. 22 ; Ex. xiii. 11–16 ; xxii. 29 f. ; xxiii. 19 ; xxxiv. 19 f., 26.

[4] Ex. xiii. 13, 15 ; xxxiv. 20 ; Num. xviii. 15 f.

were only a just tribute.[1] Deuteronomy, especially in the case of first-fruits, gives as a reason for offering them, that Jehovah brought Israel forth from Egypt to give them the good land of Canaan, flowing with milk and honey.[2] The reason for offering the first-born, as given in several passages, is the fact that Jehovah spared the first-born of the Hebrews when he slew those of the Egyptians; it was to perpetuate the memory of the deliverance from Egypt.[3]

The early documents say nothing about the way in which these offerings are to be consecrated to Jehovah. It was doubtless done in the form of sacrifice, as is indicated by Deut. xv. 21. According to this same document the victims sacrificed furnished a joyful family meal, eaten before Jehovah, *i.e.* at the sanctuary, and shared by the Levites and the poor.[4] We have here the description of a traditional custom, which Deuteronomy presupposes, rather than inaugurates; the only new provision is that these religious feasts must be celebrated exclusively at the lawful sanctuary.[5] Touching tithes, it commands that every three years they be given up to the Levites and the poor.[6] Document C, on the other hand, claims that these and many other offerings fall to the priests alone.[7] This is, moreover, the general tendency of this document: it seeks to in-

[1] *Handwörterbuch*, pp. 396, 398; Dillmann on Lev. xxvii. 30–33; [Schultz, II. pp. 10 f.].

[2] Deut. xxvi. 2–10, 15. [3] Ex. xiii. 15 f.; Num. iii. 13; viii. 17.

[4] Deut. xii. 6 f., 11 f., 17 f.; xiv. 22–27; xv. 19 f.; xxvi. 11; comp. Lev. xix. 24.

[5] Riehm, *Gesetzgebung Mosis*, p. 44; Graf, *Geschtl. Bücher des A. T.*, p. 47; [Wellhausen, pp. 156 f.].

[6] Deut. xiv. 28 f.; xxvi. 12 f. [7] Num. xviii. 8–32.

crease the revenues of the priesthood,[1] as well as attempts to modify one of the essential features of the sacrifices, by making of these sacred acts, hitherto occasions for joyful family repasts, purely ecclesiastical ceremonies.[2]

4. *Prayer.* — The religious act most universally practised, that to which man feels himself most naturally inclined, is prayer. The whole Old Testament gives proof that it was always in use among the Israelites. It doubtless accompanied the offering of sacrifices.[3] The law, however, contains no command on the subject, perhaps because the universal practice of prayer rendered any command of this kind superfluous, or because it was believed impossible to regulate so spontaneous an act of the soul. Deuteronomy gives only the formula to be employed when the first-fruits of the land and the tithes are offered,[4] and document C prescribes the benediction that the priests are to pronounce upon the people.[5] This document also in certain cases enjoins the confession of sins.[6]

It is the Psalms that furnish the most examples of prayers used among the Israelites. In them, as indeed in many other passages of the Old Testament, appears the full and complete assurance that all possible material and spiritual blessings may be obtained by prayer, and the belief that God can grant anything if it seems to him good.

[1] Graf, pp. 47 ff.; Wellhausen, pp. 156 f.; Reuss, *Histoire Sainte*, I. pp. 170 f.

[2] Wellhausen, pp. 69 ff., 76 ff.

[3] Gen. xii. 8; xxvi. 25; 1 Sam. vii. 9; Job xlii. 8; 1 Chron. xxi. 26.

[4] Deut. xxvi. 5–10, 13–15.

[5] Num. vi. 24–26.

[6] Lev. xvi. 21; Num. v. 7.

5. *Vows.*—Vows also are among the oldest religious practices of the Israelites. A vow was more than a prayer, more than a mere word; it was an act, generally a sacrifice, by which one sought to win or retain the divine favor. Document A shows us Jacob on his flight to Mesopotamia making the vow that, if Jehovah will guard and bless him, he will take him for his God, rear a sanctuary to him and pay him tithes.[1] But the most touching, tragic vow is that of Jephthah. He promises God that if he will give him victory over the Ammonites, he will offer to him as a burnt offering whatever comes out of his house on his return. But it is his daughter, whom he first meets; therefore, at the end of two months, he fulfils upon her the vow that he has uttered.[2] Saul makes the people promise under oath not to eat anything until evening, until he has been avenged upon his enemies; and Jonathan, who does not keep this vow because he knows nothing of it, only escapes being put to death by the intercession of the people for him with the king, his father:[3] so sacred and irrevocable were vows and oaths considered. Absalom claims to have made the following vow during his sojourn in Geshur: "If Jehovah will bring me back to Jerusalem, I will serve him,"[4] — evidently by offering to him sacrifices.

Although vows were customary among the Israelites of antiquity, the law pays little attention to them. The oldest legislation of the Pentateuch says nothing at all about them. Deuteronomy, presupposing the custom of making vows to Jehovah, declares that one is per-

[1] Gen. xxviii. 20–22; xxxi. 13.
[2] Jud. xi. 30–40.
[3] 1 Sam. xiv. 24 ff., 36 ff.
[4] 2 Sam. xv. 7 f.

fectly free in the matter; that it is not a sin not to make vows, but that those made must be fulfilled, and that as soon as possible.[1] This declaration shows that the Deuteronomist knew nothing of a divine law requiring vows, otherwise he would not have said that it was not a sin not to make them. As for document C, it confines itself to giving rules that must be observed in fulfilling vows.[2] Most of the other passages of the Old Testament bearing on this subject prove that vows played an important part in Israelitish piety, and that fidelity required their exact fulfilment.[3]

The foregoing discussion shows that vows were a means of rendering God favorable, and especially of securing his help at critical junctures, in the presence of great danger. The fulfilment of the vow after some deliverance or blessing, naturally became an expression of gratitude toward God.

6. *The Anathema.* — A peculiar vow, to which reference is made in document A and elsewhere, consisted in anathematizing persons or things, placing them under ban, or devoting them to destruction. Thus the Canaanitish peoples were placed under ban by command of Jehovah, because these peoples were idolaters.[4] The Israelites, also, who became idolaters, or enticed their brethren thereto, were devoted to extermination.[5] Any

[1] Deut. xxiii. 21–23; comp. Eccl. v. 3–6.

[2] Lev. vii. 16; xxii. 18; xxvii. 1 ff.; Num. xv. 3; xxx. 3 ff.

[3] Isa. xix. 21; Nah. i. 15; Jon. i. 16; ii. 9; Job xxii. 27; Prov. xx. 25; Ps. xxii. 25; l. 14; lvi. 12; lxi. 8; lxv. 1; lxvi. 13; lxxvi. 11; cxvi. 14, 18.

[4] Josh. ii. 10; vi. 17–21; viii. 26; x. 28–42; xi. 10–22; Jud. i. 17; 1 Sam. xv. 2–33; Deut. ii. 34; iii. 6; vii. 1 ff.; xx. 16–18.

[5] Ex. xxii. 20; Deut. xiii.

one who appropriated an object anathematized was himself placed under ban,[1] as was Achan.[2]

The people Israel could, of their own accord, place under ban men and things. This was done in the case of the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead,[3] and the cities belonging to the king of Arad.[4] But every individual Israelite could also place certain objects or men under ban.[5]

Thus it appears that, in general, anathema consisted in sacrificing something or some one to the divine wrath by extermination, and that the anathema was pronounced upon what displeased Jehovah. He who, of his own motion, placed something under ban, did so to please God by satisfying his anger. The anathema is, however, Lev. xxvii. 28, treated in a manner not very different from other vows by which things are devoted to the service of Jehovah.[6]

7. *The Nazirate.* — Samson is the first nazirite mentioned in history. He was consecrated to God from his mother's womb by command of the angel of Jehovah.[7] While she was pregnant with him, she was not allowed to drink wine or strong drink, or eat anything impure.[8] As for him, he could never shave his head.[9] The same obligation is assumed for Samuel, who was also a nazirite.[10] Amos reproaches the Israelites, because, among other instances of unfaithfulness, they made the nazirites drink wine, which nazirites according to him were raised up by God like the prophets.[11]

[1] Josh. vi. 18; Deut. vii. 26; comp. xiii. 17. [2] Josh. vii.
[3] Jud. xxi. 10 f. [4] Num. xxi. 1–3. [5] Lev. xxvii. 28 f.
[6] See Dillmann, *i.l.* [7] Jud. xiii. 2–5. [8] Jud. xiii. 4, 7, 14.
[9] Jud. xiii. 5; xvi. 17, 19 ff., 22 ff. [10] 1 Sam. i. 11. [11] ii. 11 f.

Samuel was at once a nazirite and a prophet. The early legal documents take no account of the nazirate. Document C is the only one that speaks of it: Num. vi. presupposes the existence of this institution, and regulates it according to the principles of Levitism. Although Samson and Samuel were nazirites for life, it has reference only to the temporary nazirate. Is this an innovation? What seems one is the regulation that we find, *vv.* 6 ff., according to which the nazirite is defiled by contact with a corpse; for Samson often came into contact with dead bodies,[1] without ceasing to be a nazirite; and Samuel, in spite of his vows, hewed in pieces King Agag, and that before Jehovah.[2] Beyond these passages the canonical books of the Old Testament do not mention the nazirate. There are references to it, 1 Macc. iii. 49 and Acts xxi. 23 f., in the sense of document C. John the Baptist, on the other hand, was a nazirite, all his life, like Samson and Samuel.[3]

The leading idea connected with the nazirate is that of special consecration to Jehovah. This follows even from the term *nazir*, which is used to designate the nazirite, and which, like *qadhosh*, holy, implies the idea of separation from the common or profane world and of consecration to God. Samson is called *nazir* of God,[4] which Segond and Reuss correctly render *consecrated to God*. Document C says that the nazirite shall be consecrated (*qadhosh*) to Jehovah,[5] just as it says of the priest.[6]

Starting from this leading idea of the nazirate, the

[1] See especially Jud. xiv. 19. [2] 1 Sam. xv. 33. [3] Luke i. 15.
[4] Jud. xiii. 5, 7 ; xvi. 17. [5] Num. vi. 8. [6] Lev. xxi. 7.

details concerning it become explicable. The mother of Samson, while she was pregnant, was not permitted to eat anything impure or drink wine, and the nazirites themselves were forbidden to drink wine or come into contact with a dead body. These same regulations apply, at least in part, to the priests. The object is to keep them in a healthy condition, as required by their special consecration to Jehovah. They evidently have the same object when applied to the nazirites.

Strict abstinence from wine among the latter, however, seems to have had its real origin in the nomadic life of the ancient Hebrews, and is best explained as a relic of the customs of that sort of life, in harmony with what Jeremiah tells us of the Rechabites.[1] They, in obedience to the command of one of their ancestors, not only abstained from wine, but also renounced the principal advantages of civilization. Customs hallowed by time, indeed, readily pass for sacred; they become a part of one's religion; it would be thought wrong to replace them by new usages. Among other peoples also, abstinence from wine was regarded as necessary to the enjoyment of unusual health.[2]

The most original feature is that which forbids the nazirite to shave his head. He must preserve his hair inviolate. This is called the consecration of God;[3] it is, as it were, the sign characteristic of it. The explanation of this feature is probably to be sought in the general idea that everything that men touch and form or

[1] Jer. xxxv. 2 ff.

[2] *Bibel-Lexikon*, IV. p. 289; *Handwörterbuch*, p. 1060; [Schultz, I. pp. 161 f.; W. R. Smith, *Prophets*, pp. 84, 388 f.; *Bible Commentary*, on Num. vi. 4].

[3] Num. vi. 7.

use belongs to the domain of the profane, and that everything that is destined for a sacred end must, as far as possible, be pure, unaltered by the hand of man. Indeed, he who gathers grapes for the first time from a newly planted vine, *profanes* it, as Deut. xx. 6 and xxviii. 30 says in the original. In building an altar consecrated to Jehovah, rough stones must be used, because man would profane them by using a chisel on them.[1] The sacred victims must never have borne the yoke or been used for ordinary labor.[2]

The hair plays a particularly important part in the nazirate, but this fact accords with a custom found among other peoples of antiquity.[3]

8. *Fasting.* — Fasting is a religious exercise anciently, and even in our own day, very widely practised among the peoples of the Orient, where abstinence from food produces less inconvenience than in our countries. The Israelites also always had the custom of fasting. Fasting often accompanied prayer or the offering of sacrifices; there were united with it other signs of humility, contrition, affliction: the subject mourned, wept, clothed himself in sackcloth, sat on the ground, rent his garments, plucked out his hair; recourse was had to fasting, especially in times of misfortune and sorrow, in cases of public or private calamity,[4] to secure divine assistance in the presence

[1] Ex. xx. 25.

[2] Num. xix. 2; Deut. xv. 19; xxi. 3; 1 Sam. vi. 7.

[3] *Bibel-Lexikon*, IV. p. 290; *Handwörterbuch*, p. 1061; [Ewald, *Antiquities*, p. 86].

[4] Jud. xx. 26; 1 Sam. i. 7; xx. 34; xxxi. 13; 2 Sam. i. 11 f.; xii. 16 f., 22 f.; Joel i. 14; ii. 12, 15; Neh. i. 4; Esth. iv. 1–3; Ps. xxxv. 13; lxix. 10 f.; cix. 24.

of danger and to avert a misfortune,[1] to express feelings of repentance, and to obtain pardon for sins.[2] In some exceptional cases fasting is represented as the means employed by men of God that they may enjoy the presence of Jehovah and obtain revelations from him.[3]

The earlier legal portions of the Pentateuch pay no attention to fasting. But document C gives some rules touching the fast that a married woman vows to perform.[4] It also prescribes that the day of atonement be a day of fasting,[5] so that here especially this practice appears as the expression of the humiliation of a sinful people before a holy God, and as the means of appeasing God and obtaining his forgiveness. The Jews celebrated four other fast-days a year, in memory of the principal events that foreshadowed and consummated the capture and overthrow of Jerusalem.[6]

The prophets felt the necessity of opposing the abuses, to which fasting as a purely external act gave rise, and of showing that such a fast could neither please God nor secure his blessings; they required of the people feelings and actions corresponding to this religious act.[7] But in the midst of Judaism these abuses only continued to develop. Fasting was practised more fre-

[1] 1 Sam. xiv. 24; 1 Kings xxi. 27–29; 2 Chron. xx. 3 f.; Ezra viii. 21, 23; Esth. iv. 15 f.

[2] Deut. ix. 18; 1 Sam. vii. 6; Jon. iii. 5, 7; 1 Kings xxi. 9, 12; Ezra ix. 3–5; x. 6; Neh. ix. 1 f.; Dan. ix. 3 ff.

[3] Ex. xxxiv. 28; Deut. ix. 9; Dan. x. 1 ff., 11 ff.; comp. Matt. iv. 2.

[4] Num. xxx. 14, 16.

[5] Lev. xvi. 29, 31; xxiii. 27, 29, 32; Num. xxix. 7.

[6] Zech. viii. 19; vii. 3–5; comp. Jer. xli. 1 ff.; lii. 4, 6 f., 12 f.

[7] Isa. lviii. 3–7; Zech. vii. 5–10; viii. 16–19; Joel ii. 12 f.

quently, and the fasts became longer; it appeared more and more as a meritorious act.[1]

The preceding discussion has shown what was the idea and the religious value of fasting. Like sacrifices, prayer, vows, it was a means of winning the divine favor. But it was also a sign of repentance and humiliation, a means of averting imminent misfortunes, a symbol of mourning and affliction, a practice seemly in imploring the forgiveness of God.

9. *Purification and Levitical Purity.* — Religious purifications are a custom among many peoples ancient as well as modern.[2] We find them also among the Hebrews. Even the early documents teach us that, before approaching Jehovah, the body had to be cleansed by ablutions and the garments changed or washed;[3] that persons defiled by any impurity could not participate in religious solemnities or touch sacred things;[4] that lepers were unclean and obliged to remain outside the Israelitish camp;[5] that cohabitation between man and woman rendered them both unclean;[6] that a distinction was to be made between clean and unclean animals;[7] that it was forbidden to eat flesh torn in the fields,[8] a kid cooked in its mother's milk[9] or blood.[10] Still other passages show that the Israelites considered

[1] Esth. iv. 16; Judith iv. 8 ff.; viii. 5 f.; Tob. xii. 8; 2 Macc. xiii. 12; Matt. vi. 16; ix. 14; Luke ii. 37; xviii. 12.

[2] *Bibel-Lexikon*, V. pp. 65, 69.

[3] Gen. xxxv. 2; Ex. xix. 10 ff.; Josh. iii. 5; 1 Sam. xvi. 5.

[4] 1 Sam. xx. 26; xxi. 5 f.

[5] Num. xii. 9–15.

[6] Ex. xix. 15; 1 Sam. xxi. 5; 2 Sam. xi. 4.

[7] Gen. vii. 2, 8; viii. 20.

[8] Ex. xxii. 31.

[9] Ex. xxiii. 19; xxxiv. 26.

[10] 1 Sam. xiv. 32–34.

it an important duty to abstain from all unclean food.[1] Deuteronomy gives some regulations on this subject. It contains a list of clean and unclean animals.[2] It also forbids the eating of animals torn in the field[3] as well as blood.[4] It commands that the criminal condemned to the gallows be buried on the day of the execution, that he may not defile the land.[5] It would exclude from the camp every one who has had a nocturnal emission, and remove from sight human excrements.[6]

It is, however, only document C that presents a complete system of regulations for cases of uncleanness. It represents as dating from the time of Noah the prohibition against eating blood, and alleges as the reason for it that the blood is the soul of all flesh.[7] It repeats this prohibition several times in the legal portion, adding to it that against eating fat.[8] It devotes, besides, a whole series of chapters to cases of uncleanness. It teaches that uncleanness results from eating unclean animals, or touching the dead body of an animal;[9] that a woman becomes unclean in childbirth,[10] and lepers by virtue of their disease;[11] that gonorrhea, whether produced by diseased or other conditions, in man, and menstruation, natural or unnatural, in woman, produce a state of uncleanness.[12] Further, the same document declares that any one who is brought into contact with a human corpse is equally unclean.[13]

[1] Hos. ix. 3; Zech. ix. 7; Ezek. iv. 14; xxxiii. 25; Isa. lxv. 4; lxvi. 17; Dan. i. 8–16; 2 Macc. vii.

[2] xiv. 3–20. [3] xiv. 21. [4] xii. 16, 23–25; xv. 23.

[5] xxi. 23. [6] xxiii. 9–14. [7] Gen. ix. 4.

[8] Lev. iii. 17; vii. 22–27; xvii. 10–14; xix. 26. [9] Lev. xi.

[10] Lev. xii. [11] Lev. xiii. f. [12] Lev. xv. [13] Num. xix. 11–22.

As to the purifications that must be undertaken in case of uncleanness, they are very various. In certain cases, one remained unclean until evening, but no special purification was required;[1] uncleanness doubtless ceased with the day on which it was contracted. In other cases one had to bathe or wash one's garments, or both, or even shave off all one's hair.[2] In still other cases a more complicated and important process of purification became necessary: a woman after childbirth could only be purified by sacrifices;[3] a leper must offer sacrifices in addition to performing the cleansing ceremonies prescribed;[4] it was the same with a man healed of gonorrhea and a woman cured of a menstrual flux;[5] finally, one who had been defiled by contact with a corpse was obliged to be purified by means of the water of purification, whose preparation and use are described, Num. xix.

As to the real significance of these customs and regulations, there is great difference of opinion among scholars.[6] The Old Testament, however, gives precise information on this subject. It is because Jehovah is holy that his people must be holy and therefore free from all defilement: this is the teaching of the three principal documents of the Pentateuch.[7] It is because the holy God dwells in the midst of his people, that

[1] Lev. xi. 24, 27, 31, 39; xiv. 46; xv. 10, 19, 23; Num. xix. 21 f.

[2] Lev. xi. 25, 28, 40; xiii. 6, 34; xiv. 18 f., 47; xv. 5 ff., 16, 18, 21 f., 27; xvii. 15; xxii. 4–7; Num. xix. 19, 21; xxxi. 24; Deut. xxiii. 10 f.

[3] Lev. xii. 6–8.

[4] Lev. xiv. 2 ff.

[5] Lev. xv. 14 f., 29 f.

[6] Dillmann, *Exodus u. Leviticus*, pp. 476 ff., 483; [Schaff-Herzog, *Encyclopœdia*, art. *Purification*].

[7] Ex. xxii. 31; Deut. xiv. 21; Lev. xi. 44; xx. 25 f.

there must be no defilement in them;[1] for it would communicate itself to the sanctuary, the dwelling of Jehovah, and would have to be punished with death.[2] For this reason also the unclean must remain outside the camp.[3]

In order to understand the thought that inspired these laws, it must not be forgotten that the ancients did not, like us, distinguish between moral and external impurity or imperfection. This is the reason why the Israelites regarded them both as equally repugnant to the holiness of Jehovah. The priests, also, and the victims offered in sacrifice had to be without physical blemish,[4] and those who performed duties at the sanctuary, on the occasion of their consecration and before fulfilling their office, were obliged to take a full or partial bath, wash their garments, and even shave their bodies.[5] One who thoroughly appreciates this point of view will understand how there could be such a thing as leprosy in garments or houses requiring purifying ceremonies;[6] why the regulation, Deut. xxiii. 12 f., to which we have already referred, was made; and why it was necessary to be in a state of cleanness to touch sacred things, objects consecrated to Jehovah.[7] Thus also, in the main, are explained the provisions that prevented contact between Jehovah and anything defiled

[1] Deut. xxiii. 14; Num. v. 3. [2] Lev. xv. 31; Num. xix. 13.

[3] Lev. xiii. 46; xiv. 3, 8; Num. v. 2–4; xii. 14 f.; xxxi. 19 f.; Deut. xxiii. 10 f.

[4] Lev. xxi. 17 ff.; xxii. 19 ff.

[5] Ex. xxix. 4; xxx. 19–21; xl. 12, 31 f.; Lev. viii. 6; xvi. 4, 24; Num. viii. 7, 21.

[6] Lev. xiii. 47 ff.; xiv. 33 ff.

[7] Lev. vii. 19 f.; xii. 4; xxii. 2 ff.; Num. ix. 6 ff.; xviii. 11, 13.

or profane. Be it remembered, moreover, that Jehovah was the King of Israel. Just as respect for a king dictates that one should not present one's self before him except in a perfectly cleanly condition, so likewise it behooved one not to appear before this divine sovereign or live in his presence, defiled by any sort of uncleanness. Finally, everything that produces repugnance in man was evidently regarded as producing the same effect upon God.

It is more difficult to say why the law condemns only certain forms of external uncleanness, why it represents one animal as clean or unclean and not another; for the Old Testament gives no explanation on this subject. A part of these regulations, however, are easy to explain. Thus many forms of disease and defilement, such as leprosy and death, inspire in man dread or disgust: he feels a strong antipathy toward them. This is equally true of certain animals. Purifying rites, in warm countries, and abstinence from certain foods have, besides, an evident utility. Guided by experience on the one hand and tradition on the other, the Israelites naturally and necessarily accustomed themselves to the practices of which we have spoken, and to which the legislators did not until later give the religious and theocratic character shown to have been impressed upon them.[1] It is, indeed, certain that we are here brought face to face with customs whose origin is lost in the gloom of antiquity, customs for the most part common to a majority of ancient peoples.

Under the rubric of cleanness must be placed a series

[1] De Wette, *Archeologie*, § 188; *Bibel-Lexikon*, V. pp. 354 ff.; [Ewald, *Antiquities*, pp. 144 f.].

of other directions that are found mostly in Lev. xviii.–xx. The regulations contained in this passage have properly been called *the laws of holiness*. They, more than all the rest of the code, assert that their object is to make of the people Israel a holy people, free from all defilement.[1]

To be a people holy and clean, it is necessary to avoid especially marriages between near relatives, incest, and sexual relations contrary to nature.[2] Transgressors against these regulations are threatened with the severest penalties.[3] It is the same with those who commit other acts of unchastity.[4] The best illustration how carefully the people of God must avoid all uncleanness of this sort, is the fact that a man sprung from an unlawful union cannot enter the congregation of Jehovah even to the tenth generation.[5]

It is perhaps to prevent acts of uncleanness of this nature that women are forbidden to wear men's clothing, and *vice versa*.[6] This prohibition may, however, at the same time have been aimed at idolatrous practices.[7] But it is more probable that it was inspired by the same motive as other laws to which we must here refer. Thus it is forbidden to mate beasts of two different species, to sow the same field with two kinds of seed, to wear garments woven of two sorts of yarn, to plough with an ox and an ass harnessed together.[8] These

[1] Lev. xviii. 24 ff.; xix. 2; xx. 7, 26.
[2] Lev. xviii. 6 ff.; Deut. xxii. 30; xxvii. 20–23.
[3] Lev. xviii. 24 ff.; xx. 10 ff.; Ex. xxii. 19.
[4] Lev. xix. 29; Deut. xxii. 20–29; Num. v. 11–31; comp. xxv. 1–9.
[5] Deut. xxiii. 2.
[6] Deut. xxii. 5.
[7] De Wette, *Archeologie*, § 190; [Ewald, *Antiquities*, p. 163].
[8] Lev. xix. 19; Deut. xxii. 9–11.

directions seem to be based on the idea that all that comes from the hand of God is good and clean; that therefore, the character given to a creature must not be changed, and that such a change would be a profanation.[1]

[1] Dillmann on Lev. xix. 19; [Ewald, *Antiquities*, pp. 160 f.].

# SECOND PERIOD.

## § 7. PROPHETISM IN ITS PURITY.

We have now come to the prophetic period *par excellence*. Prophetism in this period plays a leading part, as it did not in the preceding; it is the dominant power in the midst of the people Israel. It appears also in all its purity, freed from the traditional usages encountered among the other peoples of antiquity, which also exercised a powerful influence upon the early prophets of Israel. These latter still practised the art of divination, and their activity was not unmixed with an exaltation more or less unhealthy; the prophets of our period, on the other hand, are preachers, speaking under the influence of divine inspiration, — without, however, losing their self-consciousness, — and allowing themselves to be guided by political events, of which they are attentive observers. Another difference to be noted is, that the early prophets often employed carnal and violent means in support of the cause of Jehovah. Thus Samuel himself hewed Agag, king of the Amalekites, in pieces before Jehovah,[1] because Saul had not executed, with respect to him, the stern orders that he had received. Elisha likewise slaughtered all the prophets of Baal.[2] The numerous passages of the Old Testament, more-

[1] 1 Sam. xv. 33.

[2] 1 Kings xviii. 40.

over, which enjoin the complete extermination of the Canaanitish peoples, and mostly belong to the oldest literature, are the faithful expression of the spirit that animated primitive prophetism. The means that later prophetism uses in opposing idolatry, on the contrary, is persuasion, speech. Finally, the early prophets often played a political part; they did not hesitate to overthrow the dynasties that favored idolatry or did not vigorously enough support Jehovism, to replace them by new ones.[1] The prophets of our period are also interested in public affairs, but they seldom employ other than spiritual means to attain the end that they seek.

The literature of this period teaches us that idolatry continued to prevail in Israel until the Exile, as well as the superstitious usages inseparable from it, and especially the art of divination. But genuine prophetism vigorously opposed this traditional tendency; there was thus a prophetism that was low and rude, false and perfunctory,[2] alongside of one that was pure and spiritual, exalted and inspired; or rather the latter freed itself from the former under an influence from on high. Traditional prophetism, following the old routine, had forfeited confidence in the presence of a new and higher religious life; hence it was that such men as Amos, impelled by the prophetic spirit to leave their ordinary occupations, refused to be called prophets or sons, *i.e.* disciples of prophets, in the sense in which the term had hitherto been employed.[3]

[1] 1 Sam. xv. 17 ff.; xvi. 1 ff.; 1 Kings i. 11 ff.; xi. 29 ff.; xiv. 6 ff.; xvi. 1 ff.; xxi. 17 ff.; 2 Kings ix. 1 ff.

[2] Mic. iii. 5-7; Zech. x. 2; Jer. xxix. 8 f.; Ezek. xiii. 17–23; Isa. xliv. 25.

[3] Amos vii. 14 f.

The transformation that prophetism underwent is, moreover, marked by the difference in the names given to the prophets at different epochs. Originally they were called seers; they did not take the name prophets until later,[1] and then probably because they no longer played the part of seers or diviners, but that of prophets. What, then, does this latter title mean? The word *nabhi*, prophet, is interpreted by scholars in two ways. Some give to it a passive, others an active, signification. According to the former the prophet is above all an inspired person; according to the latter he is chiefly an interpreter of the will of God among men.[2] But whatever may be the exact etymological signification of the term in question, it is perfectly certain that the prophets are regarded at the same time as inspired persons and as interpreters of the will of God, as men to whom the will of God has been revealed by inspiration in order that they may communicate it to their people. This, as we shall see, is the teaching of a large number of passages. For the diviner or the seer, the important thing is the sign, the omen, that he sees and observes; for the prophet it is, on the one hand, inspiration, and on the other, the word by which he makes known what God has revealed to him.[3]

The prophets are first of all inspired men. They represent themselves as filled with the spirit of God and directed by him in their ministry.[4] They some-

[1] 1 Sam. ix. 9.

[2] Bleek, *Introduction*, § 178.

[3] Maybaum, pp. 113 f.

[4] Mic. iii. 8; Ezek. xi. 5; Isa. xlii. 1; xlviii. 16; lxi. 1; Zech. vii. 12; comp. Joel ii. 28; Num. xi. 17, 25 ff.; xxiv. 2; 1 Sam. x. 6, 10; xix. 20, 23; 2 Kings ii. 9, 15; Neh. ix. 30.

times describe the action of the divine spirit upon them in such terms as these: "The hand of Jehovah was on me," *i.e.* the power of God seized me, the spirit of God being regarded as a force, and so compared to the hand.[1] The prophet, being clothed with the spirit of God, can, therefore, be called "a man of the spirit."[2]

It is the spirit by which God communicates to the prophets his revelations. Indeed, the teaching of the passages just cited is that the spirit of God is granted the prophets that he may reveal to them his will, and they may be fitted to declare his word.[3] God reveals to the prophets all that he does.[4] He speaks to them and he speaks through them.[5] The prophets also claim to declare the genuine word of God, and say, of the false prophets, that they prophesy what comes from their own hearts and not what comes from the mouth of God, God not having spoken to them.[6]

It is God who raises up the prophets and sends them to his people.[7] The divine call made itself felt by the prophets with such power that they could not resist it.[8] They were convinced that they would take upon themselves grave responsibility if they neglected to fulfil the divine commission that had been entrusted to them.[9]

[1] Mic. iii. 8; Ezek. iii. 14; viii. 1–3; comp. i. 3; iii. 22; xxxiii. 22; xxxvii. 1; xl. 1; Isa. viii. 11; 1 Kings xviii. 46; 2 Kings iii. 15.

[2] See Hos. ix. 7, in the original.

[3] Comp. 2 Sam. xxiii. 2 f.; 1 Kings xxii. 24; Zech. vii. 12.

[4] Amos iii. 7. [5] Hos. xii. 10.

[6] Jer. xiv. 14; xxiii. 16, 21; Ezek. xiii. 2 ff., 7.

[7] Amos ii. 11; vii. 15; Isa. vi. 8 ff.; Jer. i. 7; vii. 25; xxv. 4; xxvi. 5; xxix. 15, 19; xxxv. 15; xliv. 4; Ezek. ii. 3; iii. 4 ff.; Zech. ii. 11; iv. 9; vi. 15.

[8] Amos iii. 8; Jer. xx. 7–9. [9] Ezek. iii. 18, 20; xxxiii. 8.

They said of the false prophets that they were not sent by God.[1]

It is already clear from what has just been said that the prophets were God's interpreters. This is still clearer from Ex. vii. 1 and iv. 16. In the former of these passages Jehovah says to Moses: "See, I have made thee God to Pharaoh, and Aaron, thy brother, shall be thy prophet." This means that there shall be between Moses and Pharaoh the same relation as between God, who makes known his will, and man, to whom this will is revealed; and that Aaron shall serve as mediator between Moses and Pharaoh, as the prophet mediates between God and man. This is expressed still more clearly in the second passage, in which Jehovah says to Moses that he shall take the place of God to Aaron, and that Aaron shall serve as his mouth, and speak for him to the people. This is the sense in which Jeremiah is designated as the mouth of God.[2] The prophets are, therefore, God's instruments; God places his words in their mouths, and they say what God commands them;[3] they play the part of interpreters among men.[4]

The prophets bear other titles that teach us what they were and what they did. They are called watchmen and guardians, or keepers,[5] because they watched over the conduct of the people, that they might rebuke

[1] Jer. xiv. 14 f.; xxiii. 21; xxvii. 15; xxviii. 15; xxix. 31; Ezek. xiii. 6.

[2] Jer. xv. 19.

[3] Deut. xviii. 18; Jer. i. 9; comp. Num. xxiii. 5, 12, 16.

[4] Isa. xliii. 27.

[5] Mic. vii. 4; Jer. vi. 17; Ezek. iii. 17; xxxiii. 7; Isa. xxi. 11 f.; lii. 8; lvi. 10; lxii. 6.

it in case of need. This is plainly expressed in three passages, — Jer. vi. 27; Ezek. iii. 17; xxxiii. 7. In the first, God speaks to the prophet: "I have placed thee on the look-out among my people, as a fortress, that thou mayst know and search their ways"; and in the other two: "I have set thee as a watchman over the house of Israel; thou shalt hear the word that goeth forth from my mouth, and thou shalt warn them for me." In accordance with this line of thought Jeremiah could regard himself as a shepherd of his people,[1] the chief care of a shepherd being, not only to feed his flock, but to watch it and protect it from all danger. The name watchman or guardian, when applied to the prophets, also evidently implies the idea that they see better than others what is going to happen, what appears in the distance, and must be warded from the people. Habakkuk says that he was at his post, that he was watching on the top of the tower, listening for what Jehovah might say to him, when a prophecy concerning the approaching punishment of the Chaldeans was communicated to him.[2] The prophets are called men of God,[3] on account of the peculiar relation that exists between them and God. They are called servants of Jehovah,[4] because they consecrate their lives to his service, and envoys or messengers of Jehovah,[5] because they are commissioned to carry his commands.

[1] Jer. xvii. 16; comp. Zech. xi. 4 ff.

[2] ii. 1 ff.

[3] 1 Sam. ii. 27; ix. 6 ff.; 1 Kings xii. 22; xiii. 1 ff.; xvii. 18, 24; xx. 28; Jer. xxxv. 4; etc.

[4] Amos iii. 7; Isa. xx. 3; Jer. xxv. 4; xxvi. 5; xxix. 19; xxxv. 15; xliv. 4; etc.

[5] Isa. xliv. 26; Hag. i. 13; Mal. iii. 1.

Since the prophets say, on every page of their writings, that they declare the word of God, and that God has spoken to them, it is necessary for us to ask in what this word consisted, and how it was communicated to the prophets. In ancient times it was believed in Israel that God spoke to men in the literal sense of this word.[1] This is certainly the sense in which it is said, in the early biblical documents, that God spoke to Adam and his descendants, to Noah and the other patriarchs, to Moses and Joshua, and afterwards to the judges and the prophets. It was believed that God caused his voice to be heard in speaking to men.[2] This, however, is not the sense in which the prophets seem to have understood the matter. Though they continued to use the language that had been adopted when it was believed that God spoke after the manner of men, the divine word addressed to them was certainly, for them, an internal word.

The prophets also called their prophecies visions; but they did so in imitation of the language of a time when actual visions played an important part in prophetism. Yet, from Philo to Hengstenberg, this form of expression has been made the basis of the doctrine that, at the time of receiving revelations, the prophets were in an ecstatic and entirely passive condition. In support of this theory, appeal is made to the words above cited, in which the prophets are called frenzied or insane men; stress is laid on the condition of exaltation and prostration into which Saul is thrown by prophetic inspiration, on the condition, somewhat less ecstatic, of Balaam, at

[1] Gen. xviii.; Ex. xxxiii. 11; Num. xii. 8.

[2] Ex. xx. 1; Deut. iv. 12; 1 Sam. iii. 4 ff.; 1 Kings xix. 13.

the time of uttering his oracles, and finally on Num. xii. 6–8, which says that while Jehovah speaks to Moses, mouth to mouth, he reveals himself to the other prophets only in visions and dreams.[1]

All this proves conclusively that, among the Israelitish prophets, there existed something like glossolaly, an inferior degree of Christian inspiration,[2] and other analogous phenomena that have since appeared in the church, chiefly under the influence of American Methodism; but it does not prove that all the prophets were in this condition when they received the divine word. Referring to the prophetic books, one discovers, on the contrary, with Bleek,[3] Oehler,[4] Schultz,[5] and others, that the prophets generally received revelations in a perfectly conscious state of mind. Reuss shows, by numerous examples, that the visions mentioned in the prophetic books are "only symbolic forms of thought and consequently simple literary contrivances, rhetorical expedients, stylistic ornaments, and nothing more."[6] One should not allow one's self to be led astray by the term vision, which is almost a synonym for prophetic and divine word.[7] The prophets say that they have seen the words or the discourses that they utter.[8] But the passages that we have cited, and others,[9] prove that they give the name visions to discourses that have ab-

[1] Tholuck, *Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen*, pp. 49 ff.; [Smith, *Dictionary*, art. *Prophet*, IV.].

[2] 1 Cor. xiv. [3] § 183. [4] § 209 ff. [5] I. pp. 274 ff.

[6] *Les Prophètes*, I. pp. 54 ff.; comp. Kuenen, *Hist. Critique des Livres de l'A. T.*, II. pp. 40 ff.; [Schultz, I. 278 ff.].

[7] 1 Sam. iii. 1; 2 Sam. vii. 17; Hos. xii. 10; Isa. xxx. 10; Ezek. i. 1–3.

[8] Amos i. 1; Isa. ii. 1; xiii. 1; Hab. i. 1; ii. 1; comp. 2 Kings viii. 13.

[9] Isa. i. 1; Ob. 1; Nah. i. 1.

solutely none of the characteristics of a vision, that are the result of reflexion. The name vision is given even to a prophetic writing that contains historical narratives.[1]

It must, however, be acknowledged that in ancient times the term vision was applied to visions properly so called. In the passage already cited, Num. xii. 6–8, revelation by visions and dreams is contrasted with direct revelation, received by Moses in a conscious state, and the latter is evidently regarded as more perfect than the former. In imitation of this passage we feel obliged to distinguish between two different points of view with reference to prophetic revelation, the primitive and imperfect on the one hand, and, on the other, the higher, which appears in the prophetic books. We have seen that dreams and visions play an important part in early prophetism, and that it was disfigured by other imperfections. But, under the influence of the spirit of God, prophetism developed; it freed itself, little by little, from the vulgar art of divination that it might fulfil a nobler mission. The seers became prophets, God's interpreters among men. Then dreams and visions, so far from being considered the means of revelation *par excellence*, were rather disparaged as an inferior or even unreliable source of revelation; they were contrasted with the genuine word, to which they were as the chaff to the wheat.[2] It is only the book of Daniel, an apocalypse, by the way, and not a prophecy, in which dreams and visions again play an important part.[3]

[1] 2 Chron. xxxii. 32.

[2] Jer. xxiii. 25–32; xxvii. 9; xxix. 8 f.; Zech. x. 2; Deut. xiii. 1 ff.

[3] ii.; iv.; vii. f.; x.–xii.

It is wrong, therefore, to conclude from Num. xii. 6–8 that no prophet except Moses received divine revelation otherwise than by dreams and visions. This is ignoring numerous facts on the testimony of a single statement. If, instead of seeing in this passage a dogmatic and infallible assertion, we regard it from the historical point of view, we shall reach the following conclusion. Since it forms part of document A, it belongs to the period of early prophetism, when inspiration was inseparable from a sort of ecstasy, when dreams and visions were the customary means of revelation. Our author, however, had sufficiently sound ideas to perceive the imperfections of such a prophetism, and took pains to show that Moses had received revelations of a higher and purer sort. Thus it appears that ancient prophetism was early felt to be imperfect.

All this shows that those who claim that the prophets, when inspired, were in an ecstatic and semi-conscious condition, have in mind primitive and imperfect prophetism, and that they ignore the growth of prophetism from the divinatory and visionary to the higher stage that we have shown it to have attained. The two kinds of Christian inspiration that St. Paul describes, 1 Cor. xiv., evidently have a close analogy with the two kinds of prophetism in ancient Israel, and, as the apostle places simple evangelical preaching above glossolaly, so we must place simple prophetic preaching above the earlier ecstatic prophetism. Riehm says, and justly, that the more ecstatic prophetic inspiration is, the more nearly it is related to an inferior stage of prophetism.[1] And Bertheau declares, with no less justice, that the

[1] *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 25.

history of prophetism shows that the less constantly the prophets enjoyed communion with God, the more they were inclined to represent the divine power as an external force taking possession of them and making them mere instruments of its will.[1]

## § 8. UNITY AND SPIRITUALITY OF GOD.

We must now explain the essential principles of the theology of the prophets, if indeed the employment of so pretentious an expression is allowable. As a matter of fact the prophets had no theology. They were preachers, not theologians. They were men of action, and not theorists or scientists. What engrossed them was practical life, not theories, abstract ideas, and still less a theological system. One finds in their works profound thoughts, grand religious and moral principles, but not a theology properly so called. It is, therefore, better to speak simply of the religion of the prophets than of their theology as it is the custom to do.

The fundamental idea of the religion of the prophets is that of the covenant of Jehovah with Israel; this appears from every age of their writings. We have already discussed it in the preceding pages, because from the beginning it lies at the foundation of the religion of Israel. What we now have to examine is, first of all, the idea that the prophets formed of the God of the covenant. For the one that we have hitherto met is not

[1] *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol.*, 1859, p. 610; comp. Köhler, *Der Prophetismus der Hebräer und die Mantik der Griechen*, p. 97; [W. R. Smith, *Prophets*, pp. 219 ff.].

that of our period. The prophets have risen to the idea of the absolute unity of God; they have generally attained to much purer conceptions of the Deity than the early Israelites.

## I. *Unity of God.*

When did the Israelites begin to free themselves from primitive and imperfect notions to rise to pure monotheism? Baudissin, in the excellent treatise which he has devoted to this subject, reaches the conclusion that Israelitish monotheism passed through three successive phases: it originally consisted in the worship of a single national god, and did not exclude the existence of other gods; in this form it existed perhaps among the Hebrews before Moses; later, especially after the prophet Hosea, they rose to the belief in a single God, but considered solely in his relations to Israel; finally, at the time of Jeremiah, they attained to strict monotheism, to the idea of a single God for all the peoples of the earth.[1] We must examine this question more closely.

Document A represents Jehovah as the Creator of the universe, and the God of the parents of the human race,[2] as the Lord of the world,[3] who destroys again, by the deluge, all that exists,[4] who confounds the speech of all men, and scatters them over the whole earth,[5] whose name and power must be heralded everywhere,[6] who judges all the earth,[7] and executes his decrees

[1] *Studien*, I. pp. 175 ff.; [Montefiore, pp. 134 ff.; 214 ff.].

[2] Gen. ii.–iv.

[3] Gen. xiv. 19, 22; xxiv. 3, 7; Ex. ix. 29; xix. 5; Num. xiv. 21; Deut. xxxii. 8, 22; Josh. ii. 11; iii. 11, 13.

[4] Gen. vi. 5 ff.

[5] Gen. xi. 1–9.

[6] Ex. ix. 16; Josh. iv. 24.

[7] Gen. xviii. 25.

among all nations,[1] who is truly the God of the spirits of all flesh.[2]

Here, then, in document A, are universal conceptions sufficiently decided to seem to imply strict monotheism, the idea that Jehovah is the sole God of the entire world. It is not, however, absolutely certain that this is the case. In ancient times the creator of heaven and earth was not necessarily regarded as the only God, but only as the supreme God.[3] Alongside of him there was room for other gods, quite as real as he, but inferior to him in power and dignity. Baudissin justly remarks that all the heathen peoples, although they believed in the reality of foreign gods, narrated the history of primitive humanity as if their gods had ruled alone at that time; that there is no essential difference between this point of view and that taken by document A in the first chapters of Genesis.[4]

It is the same with the control over other peoples attributed to Jehovah. It implies only the idea that he is a God of incomparable might, that no other god equals him in power. This is the way in which the old song, Ex. xv., views the subject. It sings the might of Jehovah, who manifests himself in the annihilation of the Egyptian army, and the deliverance of the children of Israel, but without rising above the idea expressed in the sentence: "Who is like thee among the gods, O Jehovah?"[5] It must, moreover, be observed that when Jehovah executes his decrees upon other nations, it is generally in favor of Israel; so

[1] Gen. xii. 17; xviii. f.; xx. 1 ff.; Ex. xv.; vii. 14 ff.; etc.
[2] Num. x. 22; xxvii. 16.
[3] See Gen. xiv. 19, 22.
[4] *Studien*, I. pp. 163 f.; [Schultz, I. pp. 182 ff.].
[5] *v.* 11; comp. Deut. xxxiii. 26 f.

that, even in this respect he appears simply as the national God, as the God of his chosen people.[1]

What allows us, however, to suppose that even before Hosea certain minds in Israel had already attained to pure monotheism, is that, in the song found Deut. xxxii., which probably belongs to an earlier day, idols are treated as not-gods and vanities,[2] and Jehovah alone is declared God.[3] In other passages, which are of at least as early a date as document A, we find this same declaration, that besides Jehovah there is no God.[4] Baudissin seeks to restrict the force of some of these passages,[5] but he seems to us to be wrong.

If we turn to the early prophetical books, we find in Amos the assertion that the foreign gods are simply lies.[6] Baudissin, it is true, thinks that this designation, as used by the prophet, does not imply that the idols have no reality, but that they are not able to render their worshippers the help desired, and that they disappoint the expectation placed in them.[7] In the same prophecy Jehovah is also represented as the creator of all that exists,[8] and the judge of other nations as well as of Judah and Israel.[9] But, as we have already seen, this does not necessarily mean that Jehovah is the only God.

Hosea calls the calf of Samaria a not-god, that has been fashioned by a workman.[10] He says of idols: "They are all the work of artisans,"[11] and elsewhere: "We

[1] Comp. Baudissin, *Studien*, I. pp. 158 ff.; [Schultz, I. pp. 181 f.].
[2] *vv.* 17, 21. [3] *v.* 39.
[4] 1 Sam. ii. 2; 2 Sam. vii. 22; xxii. 32; comp. Ps. xviii. 31.
[5] *Studien*, I. pp. 72, 101. [6] ii. 4.
[7] *Studien*, I. p. 100. [8] iv. 13; v. 8; ix. 6. [9] i. f.; ix. 5 ff.
[10] viii. 5 f.; comp. *v.* 4. [11] xiii. 2.

will no longer say to the work of our hands: Our God!"[1] or: "The people consult their stock."[2] He says, addressing Israel in the name of Jehovah: "Thou knowest no God but me, and there is no saviour besides me."[3]

Isaiah and the contemporary prophets also represent idols as the work of men's hands.[4] In their writings Jehovah appears as the lord of all peoples, and the governor of the entire world,[5] as the one who will sometime be worshipped by all nations.[6] Isaiah calls idols simply *elilim*, things of nought.[7]

But according to Baudissin, this does not prove that, for the prophets, these deities have no existence; they teach but one thing, *i.e.* that, for Israel, idols are inanimate images, that can give the people of Jehovah no aid; when they declare that all peoples will turn to the God of Israel, they mean simply that the gentiles will abandon the worship of their own gods to worship Jehovah because he is a greater God; the promises in question do not go so far as to say that these gods do not exist; Jeremiah and Deuteronomy are the first to teach positively that, besides Jehovah, there is no God.[8]

We cheerfully admit that from the time of Jeremiah the absolute nothingness of all gods besides Jehovah was better understood and the unity of God asserted more categorically in Israel,[9] while more stress was laid

[1] xiv. 3. [2] iv. 12. [3] xiii. 4.

[4] Isa. ii. 8; xvii. 8; xxxi. 7; Mic. v. 13.

[5] Isa. x. 5 ff.; xv. ff.; Mic. iv. 11 ff.; Zech. ix. 1 ff.

[6] Mic. iv. 1 ff.; Isa. ii. 2–4; xviii. 7; xix. 18–25.

[7] ii. 8, 18, 20; x. 10 f.; xix. 1, 3; xxxi. 7.

[8] *Studien*, I. pp. 109, 166 ff.; [Montefiore, *Lectures*, pp. 214 ff.].

[9] Deut. iv. 35, 39; vi. 4; Isa. xliii. 10–12; xliv. 6, 8; xlv. 5 f., 14, 18, 21 f.; xlvi. 9.

upon the nothingness of idols.[1] But we are inclined to think that even before that, from the time of Amos and Hosea, perhaps an earlier date, as seems to be taught by some passages of document A and the books of Samuel, certain minds had risen to the idea that Jehovah alone is truly God. We will admit that this idea found expression only at intervals, and at first waked but a faint echo in Israel; that the early prophets considered first of all the relations existing between Jehovah and Israel and sought to impress upon Israel the duty of serving only Jehovah. But we have the conviction that for Isaiah, who repeatedly declares that idols are only things of naught, for Hosea, who reiterates the statement that they are only wood, and human productions, and for still others, their contemporaries, idols had absolutely no reality.[2]

## II. *Spirituality of God.*

We have seen that the ancient Israelites pictured God to themselves in the form of man. Even the documents of our period swarm with the boldest anthropomorphisms. It is therefore superfluous to ask if the people Israel conceived of their God as a personal God. There is no possibility of doubt on this point. We must rather ask if God was not conceived as too personal, too human; if his personality is not asserted at the expense of his spirituality. This is certainly the

[1] Deut. iv. 28; Jer. ii. 11, 27 f.; iii. 9; v. 7; viii. 19; x. 1–16; xvi. 18–20; xviii. 15; Hab. ii. 18 f.; Isa. xl. 18–20; xli. 7, 21–24, 29; xliv. 9–20; xlix. 1–7.

[2] [Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, I. pp. 45 ff.]

case in earlier times, and to some extent even in our period. But there is the less reason for wondering at these imperfections, as even now Christian people, wherever they have received but scant culture, cherish analogous ideas.

Yet, on this subject also, the prophets, freeing themselves from the gross ideas of early times, rose to purer conceptions. It is only necessary to recall the following statements: Jehovah is God, and not man;[1] he has not fleshly eyes, neither sees he as men see;[2] he neither slumbers nor sleeps,[3] neither does he weary;[4] he neither eats nor drinks;[5] in fine, he cannot be likened to anything terrestrial;[6] the heights of heaven [literally, the heaven of heavens] would not hold him.[7]

This last passage is particularly instructive. It is taken from the prayer that the author of the books of Kings places in the mouth of Solomon on the occasion of the dedication of the temple, which, however, doubtless belongs to a much later date. It shows that the author had comparatively pure and lofty conceptions of God. And yet, in this same prayer, the heavens are regarded as the abode of Jehovah.[8] This latter fact shows clearly that even those who had risen above popular and imperfect ideas still used the faulty language of the people. This, however, should not surprise us, since, to this day, preachers often find themselves obliged to do thus to suit themselves to the capacity of their hearers.

On the other hand, it must be admitted that we no-

[1] Hos. xi. 9. [2] Job. x. 4. [3] Ps. xii. 1, 4. [4] Isa. xl. 28.
[5] Ps. l. 13. [6] Isa. xl. 18. [7] 1 Kings viii. 27.
[8] 1 Kings viii. 30, 32, 34, 36, etc.

where, in the Old Testament, find the statement that God is a pure spirit. Schultz, following de Wette, asserts, and justly, that even in the writings of the prophets, the spirituality of God is conceived, not in a metaphysical, but in an anthropological and popular fashion; that, according to them, God is spiritual as is the human intellect, in contrast with that which is sensual; that the most explicit statement on this subject is found in the following passage of Isaiah:[1] "The Egyptian is man and not God; his horses are flesh and not spirit."[2] He says further that it is not the spirituality of God, least of all in the philosophical and absolute sense, that, under the old covenant, forms the foundation of faith in God, but his complete and living personality, conceived in all simplicity like the personality of man; that the philosophical idea of the spirituality of God nowhere finds expression in the Old Testament; that God is conceived in a religious and not in a philosophical fashion.[3]

It is of course impossible to conclude from the passages in which there is reference to the spirit of God, that God is a pure spirit, since the spirit of God was spoken of as we ourselves speak of the spirit of man. It must, as we have already said, be frankly admitted that the prophets were not, and did not wish to be, theologians or philosophers, schoolmen, but men of action, and that, in their works, religious thought is very imperfect. It must, however, also be admitted that their religious life was strong enough to bear without disadvantage some purely theoretical imperfections.

[1] xxxi. 3. [2] II. pp. 112 f.; comp. de Wette, *Bibl. Dogmatik*, § 100.
[3] II. pp. 110 f.

Though Jewish scholasticism first, and Christian scholasticism afterwards, have succeeded in correcting, on some points, the religious thought of the Hebrew prophets, they have always displayed great lack of the mighty inspiration from on high which was the chief strength and will be the lasting glory of these men of God.

## § 9. NAMES AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

### I. *Names of God.*

In order to a better understanding of the idea of God in Israel, we must consider the names that are given to him in the documents of the first two periods. In the Old Testament, names, least of all proper names, are not arbitrary designations; they denote the characteristics of the persons or things to which they are applied. This is the case with the names of God; they tell what God is.

1. *Jehovah.* — We begin with the name Jehovah, which we find in the oldest documents. It is the proper name of the God of Israel. Therefore the Old Testament never gives it to foreign gods. If we should succeed in grasping its exact signification, we should know what idea the Israelites, from ancient times, formed of their God. Unfortunately scholars have not yet been able to agree on this subject. We can, nevertheless, put aside the numerous explanations that give to the name Jehovah a metaphysical signification. The Israelites gave it to their God at a time when, far from busying themselves with metaphysics, they still had very rude conceptions of the Deity. Two interpreta-

tions only deserve to be taken into account: that proposed by Schrader, which has won many adherents, and that which Dillmann, among others, defends in a very satisfactory manner.

The name Jehovah, in Hebrew *Yahweh*, probably comes from the root *hayah* or *hawah*, *be*. Schrader claims that it is a Hiphil, and that its significance is, not *he who is*, as Ex. iii. 14 would have it, he who possesses life, but he who provides life, who is the author of it, who is the creator.[1] Let us first observe that *Yahweh* can be a Qal as well as a Hiphil. From the grammatical point of view, therefore, the biblical interpretation, "he who is," is as well founded as that of Schrader. Besides, we are inclined to believe that this scholar is not in the right because his explanation is too metaphysical, and does not harmonize with the religious ideas of the early Israelites. They did not regard Jehovah as above all the Creator, the author of all that exists, but as their king and their protector.

We find an interpretation of this name, Ex. iii., which belongs to document A. We read there as follows: When God wished to send Moses to the children of Israel to deliver them from Egyptian servitude, he said: "I will go then to the children of Israel and say to them: The God of your fathers sends me to you. But if they ask me what his name is, what shall I answer them?" And God replied to him: "I am he who is." He afterwards commissioned him to go and say to the children of Israel: "It is *Ehyeh* (I am) who sends me to you." "It is *Yahweh* (He who is), the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac,

[1] *Bibel-Lexikon*, art. *Jehova*; [comp. KAT on Gen. ii. 4 *b*].

and the God of Jacob, who sends me to you. This is my name forever."[1]

This interpretation of the name of Jehovah seems perfectly correct from the etymological point of view. It should not then be placed on the same level with the false etymologies that are found in large numbers in the Old Testament and even in document A.[2] However, the adoption of this interpretation does not enable one to grasp the exact signification of the term under discussion. Many of those who have adopted it have found in the name Jehovah only the assertion of the real or the eternal existence of God. Hence the well-known [French] rendering: *l'Eternel*. But the most accomplished scholars now reject this too abstract interpretation, and adopt another and simpler. Dillmann is of the number. He points out that the passage, Ex. iii., lays stress on the fact that Jehovah is the God of the fathers, and that in this respect he remained for the people what he was for their ancestors. He therefore concludes that the name Jehovah must be a reminder that the God of Israel is and will be always the same, that he is unchangeable, not in the metaphysical, but in the moral sense. He adds that several passages[3] prove this signification to have been accepted in later times.[4] The name Jehovah, then, taken in the sense of moral immutability, would imply the idea of the faithfulness of God, as has been perceived by Hävernick,[5] Oehler,[6] and Schultz.[7]

[1] *vv.* 13–15. [2] Dillmann on Ex. iii. 14 f.; [Delitzsch on Gen. ii. 4 *b*].
[3] Hos. xii. 4–6; Isa. xxvi. 4; Mal. iii. 6.
[4] *Exodus u. Leviticus*, p. 35.
[5] *Theologie des A. T.*, 2 ed., p. 46. [6] § 39. [7] II. p. 138.

We prefer this latter interpretation, because originally, and ever afterwards, the unchangeable faithfulness of God was of prime importance from the standpoint of the religion of Israel, which had as a foundation the covenant between the people and God, and as a capstone the most glowing divine promises. What was of most importance to Israel was to know that God remained faithful to his promises, to the covenant established. This is exceedingly well expressed, Deut. vii. 9, where it is said that Jehovah is a faithful God, who keeps his covenant and his mercy. The early documents also very frequently extol the faithfulness of God, at times connecting this attribute with the name Jehovah. We read, Ex. xxxiv. 5 f., that Jehovah passed before Moses and proclaimed his name, saying: "Jehovah, Jehovah, merciful and compassionate God, slow to anger, rich in grace and *faithfulness!*" In the old song, Deut. xxxii., the sacred poet, after having invoked heaven and earth to hearken to the solemn words about to follow, proceeds, *v.* 3, in these terms: "I will proclaim the name of Jehovah. Give glory to our God! He is the rock. . . . He is a *faithful* God and without iniquity; he is just and upright." Jehovah is here called the rock. This designation must evidently denote his unshakable faithfulness. The song several times calls Jehovah by this name.[1] In other passages more or less early, Jehovah is called the rock of Israel, a rock for all times, or, in parallelism, to express the same idea, a buckler, a fortress, a sure refuge.[2] Hosea,

[1] *vv.* 15, 18, 30 f.

[2] Isa. xxx. 29; xxvi. 4; Ps. xviii. 2, 30; xxviii. 1; xxxi. 2 f.; xlii. 9; lxxxix. 18, 26; xci. 4 ff., 9 ff.; cxliv. 1 ff.

addressing Israel in Jehovah's name, says: "I will betroth thee to me in faithfulness, and thou shalt know Jehovah."[1] He calls Jehovah the faithful Holy One.[2] We will quote one more early passage in which the unchangeableness and faithfulness as well as the truthfulness of Jehovah are admirably described: "God is not man, that he should lie, nor a son of man that he should repent. What he hath said, will he not do? What he hath uttered, will he not perform?"[3] Elsewhere we find declarations of the same sort, expressing the idea that Jehovah does not recall his word, that he neither changes nor repents, that he keeps his promises and fulfils his threats.[4]

It appears from all the above passages, — and many others of the same import might be cited, — that the prophets, and the Israelites generally, far from engaging in transcendental speculations concerning God, or approaching the idea of God from the metaphysical side, attached so much the more importance to his moral perfections, especially his unchangeable faithfulness.

2. *Jehovah, God of Hosts.* — We must, in the second place, consider a name of God composed of *Ṣebhaoth*, hosts, and *Yahweh* or *Elohim* (God), or both: *Yahweh Ṣebhaoth*, *Elohe Ṣebhaoth*, *Yahweh Elohe Ṣebhaoth*.[5] This composite name is not used in all the books of the Old Testament. It is not met in the oldest documents,

[1] ii. 20. [2] xi. 12.

[3] Num. xxiii. 19; comp. 1 Sam. xv. 29.

[4] Isa. xxxi. 2; Ezek. xxiv. 14; xvii. 24; Zech. viii. 14 f.; Mal. iii. 6; Ps. cii. 25–27; cx. 4.

[5] 1 Sam. i. 3; iv. 4; Amos iii. 13; iv. 13; Hos. xii. 5; Zech. ix. 15; x. 3; Mic. iv. 4; Isa. i. 9, 24; v. 24; Jer. ii. 19; vi. 6, 9; Ps. lxxx. 7, 14.

and it disappears again after the Exile. It is found especially in the books of Samuel, those of Kings, a number of prophetical books, from Amos to Isaiah, and in a series of psalms.

In order to get the true signification of this name we must allow ourselves to be guided by the word *Ṣebhaoth*. Now this plural always denotes terrestrial armies, more particularly those of Israel. On this fact has been based the opinion that the name *Yahweh*, or *Elohe*, *Ṣebhaoth* denotes only the God of the hosts of Israel.[1] Others, on the contrary, claim that it denotes chiefly or only the God of the celestial hosts, the stars and the angels.[2] Hävernick, in his turn, asserts that this name takes its origin from Gen. ii. 1, and that the term *Ṣebhaoth* includes all the creatures of God, and not merely the army of Israel or the stars.[3] Still others maintain that originally this name referred only to the hosts of Israel, but that afterwards it was applied also to the starry and angelic hosts.[4] We think that the last come nearest to the truth.

Even in the song of Deborah, as well as all the rest of the Old Testament, the wars of Israel are regarded as the wars of Jehovah.[5] In the oldest documents,

[1] Baur on Ps. xxiv. 10, in de Wette's *Commentary*, 5 ed.; Schrader, *Bibel-Lexikon*, V. pp. 702 f.; *Jahrbücher für prot. Theol.*, 1875, pp. 319 f.; [Schultz, II. 139f.].

[2] Hupfeld and Delitzsch on Ps. xxiv. 10; Oehler, §§ 195 ff.; Reuss, *Les Prophètes*, I. pp. 32 f.; [Cheyne on Isa. i. 9].

[3] *Theologie des A. T.*, pp. 48 f.

[4] De Wette, *Archeologie*, § 97; von Cölln, *Bib. Theologie*, I. pp. 104 f.; Schultz, II. pp. 139 f.

[5] Jud. v. 23; comp. vii. 18, 20; 1 Sam. xvii. 47; xviii. 17; xxv. 28; etc.

when Israel is at war with another people, it is Jehovah who directs the conflict, and, when Israel obtains the victory, it is Jehovah to whom the glory redounds.[1] Jehovah is very early represented as a warrior.[2] A document perhaps older than any that we now possess bore the title: "Wars of Jehovah."[3] It is in all probability this mode of thought that gave rise to the name *Yahweh Ṣebhaoth*. The hosts of Jehovah were at first the armies of Israel, as 1 Sam. xvii. 45 says in so many words.

It is possible to show from a series of passages that the host or hosts of Jehovah are the stars[4] and the angels[5] or even all creatures.[6] It must, however, be observed that these passages almost all belong to late documents that do not employ the plural *Sebhaoth;* so that the origin and primitive signification of this name of God are not to be sought in them.

It is clearly necessary to suppose a development and to some extent a transformation of the original idea of this name. It had at first a restricted sense, was applied only to the army or people of Israel, Jehovah being regarded solely as the national God of this people. But, little by little, it acquired a broader, more general signification, and finally, when Jehovah was recognized as the only true God and the creator of all things, it came to include all the works of creation. It even became

[1] Jud. v.; Ex. xv.; comp. Ex. xiv. 14; Jud. iv. 14; 2 Sam. v. 24.

[2] Ex. xv. 3. [3] Num. xxi. 14.

[4] Jer. xxxiii. 22; Isa. xl. 26; xxxiv. 4; Neh. ix. 6; Ps. xxxiii. 6.

[5] Josh. v. 14 f.; comp. Gen. xxxii. 1 f.; Deut. xxxiii. 2; 1 Kings xxii. 19; 2 Kings vi. 16 f.; Isa. xxiv. 21; Job i. 6 ff.; ii. 1 ff.; Ps. lxxxix. 5–7; cxlviii. 2.

[6] Ps. ciii. 21 f.; cxlviii. 2 ff.; Gen. ii. 1.

synonymous with almighty creator, supreme ruler, governor of the entire world; for the Seventy in many passages render it παντοκράτωρ.[1] Though, in the beginning, this name was simply intended as a reminder that Jehovah was the head of the army or of the people Israel, that he directed the conflicts of Israel and secured them victory, afterwards, as we have just seen, when the religious horizon was broadened, it took a broader and higher signification.

3. *The Holy One of Israel.* — The Old Testament not only predicates of Jehovah holiness ; it also calls him the Holy One or the Holy One of Israel. This, again, is one of the names of God. It is fitting, therefore, that we should speak of it at this point.

What does the Old Testament mean by the holiness of God? To this question scholars have given very divergent answers.[2] Nor is the etymology decisive.[3] It is, however, certain that the English word *holy* is far from being an exact rendering of the Hebrew term *qadhosh.* We must, therefore, by a careful study of the original, gain an exact idea of the meaning of holiness in Hebrew literature. This is what Baudissin has undertaken in the excellent study already quoted, which will doubtless put an end to the arbitrary and erroneous explanations hitherto given of the term and the conception under discussion.

Even in the old passage: "Who is like thee among the gods, O Jehovah? Who is like thee, glorious in

[1] 2 Sam. v. 10 ; vii. 8, 25, 27 ; 1 Kings xix. 10, 14 ; Amos iii. 13 ; iv. 13 ; etc.

[2] Baudissin, *Studien*, II. pp. 5 ff. ; [Schultz, II. pp. 167 f.].

[3] Baudissin, *Studien*, II. pp. 19 ff. ; [W. R. Smith, *Prophets*, p. 224].

holiness, fearful in praise, doing wonders?"[1] — the holiness of God denotes his majesty, his greatness, his exaltation, his matchlessness. Another old song calls God holy, thereby meaning that he is incomparable and infinitely exalted.[2] It even seems as if this epithet, placed at the beginning of the song, must sum up all the other perfections of God that are celebrated in it, denoting chiefly his supreme power.[3] In the prophecy of Hosea, Jehovah says: "I am God, and not a man; I am the Holy One in the midst of thee."[4] He reproaches Judah with their inconstancy toward God, the faithful Holy One.[5] It is evident that here the terms God and Holy One are synonymous. It is well known that, in first and second Isaiah, Jehovah is very often called the Holy One of Israel, or simply the Holy One, *i.e.* the God of Israel or the true God.[6] It is the same elsewhere.[7] According to Ezekiel God makes himself known as Jehovah, the God of Israel, the mighty and true God, by sanctifying himself or manifesting his holiness.[8] It is, moreover, to be observed that God swears by his holiness[9] as he swears by himself.[10]

Holiness then seems to be synonymous with divinity. Baudissin, in fact, justly maintains that the Hebrew

[1] Ex. xv. 11. [2] 1 Sam. ii. 2.

[3] Comp. Isa. xl. 25 ff.; Ps. lxxvii. 13 ff.

[4] xi. 9. [5] xi. 12.

[6] Isa. i. 4; v. 19, 24, etc.; xl. 25; xli. 14, 16, 20, etc.

[7] Hos. xi. 12; Job vi. 10; Hab. i. 12; iii. 3; Jer. l. 29; li. 5; Ezek. xxxix. 7; Ps. lxxi. 22; lxxviii. 41; lxxxix. 18.

[8] xx. 41 f.; xxviii. 22; xxxvi. 23; xxxviii. 16, 23; xxxix. 7; comp. Baudissin, *Studien*, II. pp. 80 ff.

[9] Amos iv. 2; Ps. lxxxix. 35; lx. 6.

[10] Gen. xxii. 16; Ex. xxxii. 13; Amos vi. 8; Jer. xxii. 5; xlix. 13; li. 14; Isa. xlv. 23.

said holy where we say divine or heavenly.[1] Consequently holiness, when predicated of Jehovah, denotes not so much one of his peculiar attributes, as the entirety of his divine character. We shall find what we have just asserted confirmed further on, where we shall see that angels are called holy ones, and gods or sons of gods. The English expression that best expresses the idea of holiness in the sense of the Old Testament is divine exaltation or majesty. It is only necessary to examine the numerous passages in which, under various forms, there is reference to the divine holiness, to be convinced that they most frequently convey the idea of divine glory, majesty, exaltation, greatness.

Holiness in the sense of the English word, denoting the opposite of moral evil, is seldom expressed by the word *qadhesh* and its derivatives, though it is attributed to God in the whole Old Testament. It can be proven from every page that the God of Israel hates evil and loves only good. The book of Job especially gives a very exalted idea of the holiness of God thus understood. It says that God finds even the angels guilty of sin.[2] Some portions of Hebrew literature, especially document C,[3] also predicate of God holiness as contrasted with Levitical uncleanness. Hence the numerous instances in which uncleanness of this sort is forbidden in the Pentateuch. On account of his holiness, God is also exalted above all that is profane, resenting the profanation of his holy name.[4]

[1] Pp. 79, 114 f., 124 f. [2] iv. 18 ; xv. 15 ; comp. xxv. 4–6 ; Hab. i. 13.
[3] Lev. xi. 44 f.; xix. 2 ; xx. 7, 26.
[4] Amos ii. 7 ; Ezek. xx. 22, 39 ; xxxvi. 20–23 ; xxxix. 7, 25 ; xliii. 7 f.; Isa. xliii. 27 f. ; Mal. i. 11 f. ; Lev. xx. 3 ; xxii. 2, 32.

The holiness of God bears an intimate relation to his jealousy, his wrath, and his vengeance. The connection between the holiness of God and his jealousy is indicated even in document A, in which Joshua says to the people: "Ye cannot serve Jehovah, for he is a holy God, he is a jealous God."[1] According to Oehler the jealousy of God is nothing but his holiness active, breaking forth.[2] What most provokes the jealousy of God is the idolatry of Israel, the worship paid by them to other gods.[3] Schultz justly remarks that the idea of the jealousy of God rests on that of the conjugal union between him and his people.[4] Hence the use of the word adultery to designate idolatry in Israel. But God is also moved to jealousy for his people when he sees them in a condition of distress or humiliation.[5] This latter sentiment, called jealousy with reference to foreign peoples and oppressors, may change to pity for Israel.[6] It is this sort of jealousy that Moses and Joshua seek to arouse in God in order to placate him toward his people and change his wrath into forgiveness.[7]

The wrath of God, like his jealousy, is a result, a manifestation, of his holiness.[8] This appears very clearly, Ezek. xxxviii. 18–23, where it is said that, in

[1] Josh. xxiv. 19. [2] § 48; comp. Schultz, II. pp. 175 ff.

[3] Ex. xx. 3–5; xxxiv. 13 f.; Deut. xxxii. 16, 21; iv. 23 f.; vi. 14 f.; xxix. 18–20; Ps. lxxviii. 58. [4] II. p. 177.

[5] Ezek. xxxvi. 5; Joel ii. 18; 2 Kings xix. 31; Zech. i. 14; viii. 2.

[6] Joel ii. 18.

[7] Ex. xxxii. 11 ff.; Num. xiv. 13 ff.; Deut. ix. 25 ff.; Josh. vii. 7 ff.

[8] Oehler, § 48; Schultz, II. pp. 175 f.; Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung u. Versöhnung*, II. p. 137.

his jealousy and his wrath, Jehovah will execute judgment upon the country of Israel, and thus glorify and sanctify himself. Deut. xxxii. 16 and 22 ff. show that the jealousy aroused in God by the idolatry of Israel afterwards kindles his wrath and impels him to punish the guilty. The same is the case in Deut. vi. 15 and Ps. lxxviii. 58 f. These passages show to some extent what idea Israel had of the wrath of God. Other illustrations, drawn exclusively from early passages, will confirm the above result.

In the old song, Ex. xv., the poet, speaking to Jehovah, cries: "In the greatness of thy majesty thou overthrowest thy adversaries; thou loosest thy wrath; it consumeth them as stubble."[1]

In another song in document A, the poet says to the people: "Thou hast forsaken the Rock that gendered thee, and thou hast forgotten the God that begot thee. Jehovah saw it, and he became angry, indignant at his sons and his daughters."[2] The wrath of God is kindled against Moses, when he hesitates to betake himself to Egypt to deliver the children of Israel.[3] It is inflamed against the people Israel after they have made the golden calf.[4] The wrath of God, then, breaks forth whenever his will encounters opposition, when it is ignored or transgressed, and it manifests itself in severe penalties. It is to be observed that there are references to the wrath of God throughout Hebrew literature, and that they are most frequent in the documents dating from the time when prophetism had reached its apogee, Deuteronomy and Jeremiah. This proves that at that

[1] *v.* 7.
[2] Deut. xxxii. 18 f.
[3] Ex. iv. 14.
[4] Ex. xxxii. 10 ff.

time God was still represented after a very human fashion.

The vengeance of God appears as a consequence of his jealousy and his anger. This could not be better expressed than by Nah. i. 2: "Jehovah is a jealous God, he avengeth himself; Jehovah avengeth himself, he cherisheth malice toward his enemies." Micah, likewise, makes Jehovah say: "In my wrath and my fury I will execute vengeance upon the nations who have not hearkened."[1] Similar words are found, Ezek. xxv. 14, 17. Further, in later as well as in earlier passages, there are references to the vengeance of God, who sometimes punishes Israel for their disobedience, and sometimes smites the foreign peoples who have oppressed Israel and are treated as enemies of Jehovah himself.[2]

4. *God, the Strong One, the Mighty One, the Most High, the Lord.* — Having spoken of the above names, which the Israelites gave only to their God, we come to a series of names of a more general character, and, for that reason, less characteristic than the preceding.

The most general and indefinite name, and one that the Israelites gave to Jehovah in all periods, is *Elohim*. Document C, and also one of the sources of document A, designate God only by this name in narrating events prior to the call of Moses. Now it is found in no other Semitic language; hence it must be supposed that it is of Hebrew origin. Unfortunately scholars are not agreed respecting its etymology. According to that

[1] v. 14.

[2] Deut. xxxii. 35, 41–43; Isa. i. 24; xxxv. 4; xlvii. 3; lix. 17 f.; lxi. 2; lxiii. 4; Jer. v. 29; xlvi. 10; l. 15, 28; li. 6, 11, 36; Ps. xciv. 1.

suggested by Gesenius in his dictionary, it is from a root that would make it synonymous with religious fear, and this interpretation agrees very well with the old passages, Gen. xxxi. 42, 53.[1] It has, in fact, an indefinite sense, and is equivalent to the Latin *numen* and the English *divinity*.[2] There is a similarly indefinite and elastic sense in which it may also be applied to man. Thus it is said of Moses that he will be *Elohim* to Aaron and Pharaoh.[3] It is probably also men clothed with judicial or some other authority to whom this name is found applied in the following passages: Ex. xxi. 6; xxii. 8 f., 28; Jud. v. 8; 1 Sam. ii. 25; Ps. lxxxii. 6.[4] The king of Israel is once called *Elohim*;[5] Samuel is also designated by this word when he appears after death.[6] It is likewise said that the house of David will be like *Elohim*.[7] This name, then, denotes a power or a being of a superior nature.[8] It is applied to heathen divinities, as well as to the God of Israel, and denotes no peculiar quality inhering in this last.

Since *Elohim* is a plural, it has been claimed that there is in it a relic and a proof of the polytheism of the early Hebrews. This thesis has found numerous opponents. Baudissin, however, defends it,[9] and we

[1] Comp. de Wette, *Archeologie*, § 97; Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, 2 ed. I. pp. 76 f., 79; [Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, I. p. 41].

[2] Oehler, § 36; Hitzig, *Bibl. Theol.*, pp. 36 f.

[3] Ex. iv. 16; vii. 1.

[4] Schultz, II. p. 126; Dillmann on Ex. xxi. 6; Bertheau on Jud. v. 8.

[5] Ps. xlv. 6 f.; see Delitzsch, *i.l.*

[6] 1 Sam. xxviii. 13.

[7] Zech. xii. 8.

[8] Comp. Reuss, *Geschichte*, § 69.

[9] *Studien*, I. p. 55; [Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, I. p. 224].

think that he is right in so doing. In fact, the Bible furnishes so many proofs of the polytheism of the early Hebrews that this statement ought not to be seriously disputed. In the Old Testament, it is true, this name is always construed as a singular when it is applied to the God of Israel; but this proves simply that at the date of the earliest biblical documents faithful Israelites were already imbued with the principle that their people should have but one God.

The names of God that remain to be examined present a more precise idea of divinity than that of which we have just spoken. There is first *El*, which means strong. This is perhaps the oldest name of God among the Hebrews.[1] It is found in very old portions of document A.[2] The passages cited prove that this name was applied to foreign divinities as well as to the God of Israel.[3]

It is one of the old fragments already cited in which we find the divine name *Shadday*,[4] which means *mighty*. Of this and the preceding was formed a composite name,[5] *El-Shadday*, which is generally translated *almighty*. It is rather an emphatic expression for the idea of power.

Another epithet was very anciently combined with *El*, *viz. Elyon*, *most-high;* hence the composite name, *El-Elyon*.[6] Document A calls God "Most-High, lord," "possessor," or, according to some translators, "creator, of heaven and earth."[7] But this epithet must anciently

[1] Oehler, § 36; Schultz, II. pp. 128 f.

[2] Gen. xlix. 25; Ex. xv. 2, 11; xxxiv. 14.

[3] See especially Gen. xxxiii. 20. [4] Gen. xlix. 25. [5] Gen. xliii. 14.

[6] Gen. xiv. 18–20, 22; Num. xxiv. 16; Deut. xxxii. 8.

[7] Gen. xiv. 19, 22.

have served as a reminder that the God of Israel was more exalted than all the other *Elim* or *Elohim*,[1] while the epithet *Shadday* asserted that he was really a mighty God, and not one of the powerless gods that the other nations worshipped.

God was also early called *Haadhon*, the Lord,[2] or *Adhonay*, my Lord.[3] This name expresses, in a greater degree than those preceding, the feeling of dependence in man over against God.[4] It implies the idea that man is the servant of God, that he owes him obedience; that he belongs to him;[5] while the names preceding imply rather the idea of the power and authority that God possesses over all things.

## II. *Attributes of God.*

Since in Israel the names of God were not arbitrary designations, but denoted perfections that were attributed to the Deity, we have not been able to speak of them without at the same time mentioning a number of attributes of God. We must now dwell on those to which hitherto no reference has been made, or of which there remains something to be said.

We have seen that among the attributes of God, those that had most importance for the Israelites were the moral attributes. It will, therefore, be best to begin with them, and speak of the metaphysical attributes afterwards.

1. *Moral Attributes.* — We know that the attribute *par excellence* of Jehovah, denoted moreover by his very

[1] Schultz, II. pp. 129 f.
[2] Ex. xxiii. 17; xxxiv. 23.
[3] Gen. xv. 2, 8; xviii. 3, 27, 30.
[4] See especially Gen. xviii. 27.
[5] Hävernick, *Theologie*, pp. 47 f.; Oehler, § 42; Schultz, II. p. 129.

name, is his immutability, his unshaken faithfulness. Another attribute that is inseparable from the faithfulness of Jehovah is his *truthfulness*. His faithfulness being chiefly manifested in the fulfilment of his promises, the maintenance of the covenant made with Israel, it can, from a slightly different point of view, be said that to be faithful, for him, is to be truthful in his words, in his promises. Thus the veracity and the faithfulness of God are in a sense identical. It is even true etymologically, since the same Hebrew terms, as applied to God, are, in the versions, sometimes rendered faithfulness, and sometimes truthfulness or truth.

The passage already cited, Num. xxv. 19, places clearly before us the intimate relation that exists between the truthfulness of God and his unchangeableness or his faithfulness.[1] Another passage, 2 Sam. vii. 27–29, shows that it is the promises of God in which his word is chiefly trusted as a word of truth. Ps. lxxxix. only develops the thought expressed in the preceding passage with reference to the covenant of Jehovah with David.[2] Thus the faithfulness or truthfulness of God is there repeatedly extolled.[3]

The *justice* of Jehovah, to which there is so frequent reference in the Old Testament, is also found in the closest relation with his faithfulness. The term *justice* in the Hebrew language is synonymous with rectitude.[4] We read, Deut. xxxii. 4, that Jehovah is a faithful God and without iniquity, that he is just and right.

[1] Comp. 1 Sam. xv. 29. [2] *vv.* 3 f., 19 ff., 26 ff., 34 ff., 39.
[3] *vv.* 1 f., 5, 8, 14, 24, 28, 33–35, 37, 49.
[4] Oehler, § 47; Diestel, *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol.*, 1860, p. 174.

The prophet Hosea makes Jehovah say, not only that he will betroth himself with Israel in faithfulness, but also that he will betroth himself with them in justice and equity, or, as others translate it, in justice and rectitude.[1] In Zechariah Jehovah declares that, under the new covenant, he will be the God of his people, with truth and rectitude, or, according to other translators, with faithfulness and justice.[2] The book of Nehemiah relates that the chiefs of the people said to God: "Thou hast been just in all that has happened to us, for thou hast shown thyself faithful."[3]

Hence we see, on the one hand, the close relation that exists between the faithfulness of God and his justice, and on the other, that which exists between the idea of divine justice and that of the covenant made with Israel. In fact, in the making of the covenant, the divine justice played the same part as the divine truthfulness and faithfulness. It was a guaranty to Israel that Jehovah was acting toward them in uprightness, that his words and his deeds merited entire confidence, that there was not mingled with them the least deceit.

Though the divine justice plays an important part in the covenant made with Israel, it plays one more important still in the judgment of God. It is chiefly ascribed to God as the supreme judge who renders to each according to his works, blessing the just and punishing the wicked.[4] Diestel, however, points out that the

[1] Hos. ii. 19. [2] Zech. viii. 8. [3] Neh. ix. 33.

[4] Gen. xviii. 25; Isa. v. 16; lviii. 2; Zeph. iii. 5; Jer. xi. 20; Lam. i. 18; Job xxxiv. 10–12; Ezr. ix. 15; Neh. ix. 33; Dan. ix. 14; Ps. vii. 8–17; ix. 4 ff., 7 ff., 16 ff.; xi. 4–7; xviii. 20–30; l. 6; xcvi. 13; cxix. 75, 137; cxxix. 4.

matter must not be understood as if God were judge by virtue of his justice, this being the source of the judgment that he exercises; but that he is the judge of the world and of his people, inasmuch as he is the almighty governor, the supreme ruler; that the divine justice, being associated with the judgment of God, indicates what is the character of this judgment, *i.e.* that God exercises judgment according to the rules of equity.[1] He further calls attention to the fact that misfortune is never caused by the justice of God, and that in the narratives antedating the Exile there is no relation, much less identity, between the wrath of God and his justice;[2] that this identification does not take place until after the Exile, as is proven especially by 2 Chron. xii. 5–7.[3] Those who suffer through the injustice of men can, on the contrary, have recourse to God for justice, succor, deliverance. The justice of God, far from being like his wrath contrasted with his love, is often associated or identified with it, and it is regarded as the source of the divine blessings.[4] Thus several passages, one of which is very old, speak of the *ṣidheqoth*, justices of Jehovah; that is, the deeds of justice or benefits of Jehovah.[5]

The goodness or the *grace* of Jehovah, *chesedh*, mentioned as early as Ex. xv. 13, is frequently placed in

[1] *Jahrbücher*, as above, pp. 176 f.; [Schultz, II. p. 153].

[2] p. 186; [Schultz, II. p. 176].

[3] pp. 192 f.; [Schultz, II. pp. 176 f.].

[4] Mic. vii. 9; Isa. xxx. 18; xli. 10; xlii. 6, 21; xlv. 13, 21; xlvi. 13; li. 5 f., 8; lvi. 1; lxi. 8; Mal. iv. 2; Ps. xxxi. 1; xxxiii. 5; xxxv. 23 ff.; xxxvi. 6, 10; xlviii. 9 ff.; li. 15; lxv. 5; lxxi.; etc.

[5] Jud. v. 11; 1 Sam. xii. 7; Mic. vi. 5; comp. Isa. xlv. 24; Ps. lxix. 27; ciii. 6.

close relation with the preceding attributes, and, in some early passages, with the name Jehovah. Here we must again quote Ex. xxxiv. 5 f.: "Jehovah, Jehovah, merciful and compassionate God, slow to anger, rich in grace and faithfulness." In another passage of document A, Ex. xxxiii. 19, we find a similar periphrase of this name of God; Jehovah there says to Moses: "I will cause all my goodness to pass before thee and proclaim before thee the name of Jehovah: I show grace to whom I show grace and mercy to whom I show mercy." The intimate relation that exists between the faithfulness and the justice of God, on the one hand, and his grace, on the other, appears especially in another passage already cited, Hos. ii. 19, where Jehovah declares that he will betroth himself to Israel, not only in justice and faithfulness, but also in grace and mercy. If the faithfulness of Jehovah, by which the covenant made with David is guaranteed, is highly extolled in Ps. lxxxix., it is the same with his goodness.[1]

The preceding discussion shows that the grace of Jehovah plays some part in the covenant made with Israel. It remains to be seen just what this part is. If God has chosen Israel for his people, it is a simple favor, an act of pure grace, as we have already seen. Thus we read, Deut. vii. 9, that Jehovah is a faithful God, who keeps his covenant and his grace. The covenant and the grace of God are here represented as one and the same thing. A similar statement will be found put into the mouth of God with reference to the covenant made with David: "I will keep my grace for him forever, and my covenant with him shall be faithful."[2]

[1] *vv.* 1 f., 14, 28, 33, 49. [2] Ps. lxxxix. 28.

If God's covenant was established out of sheer grace, it is also maintained by grace ; for Israel, by reason of their numerous and repeated unfaithfulnesses, no longer deserve that this covenant be maintained. This explains why Deut. iv. 31 says that Jehovah will not forget the covenant confirmed by an oath to the fathers, because he is merciful.

The *love* of God, in its various forms, especially as grace, mercy, and compassion, finds mention in a large number of passages in document A, besides Ex. xxxiii. 19 and xxxiv. 5 f. just quoted.[1] It should be observed that even here the love of God is regarded as much surpassing his jealousy and his anger: though God punishes the wicked to the fourth generation, he shows mercy to the thousandth, to those who love him and keep his commandments.[2]

In the early documents there is almost exclusive reference to the love of God for Israel, manifesting itself in blessings and deliverances of every kind granted this people. In the more recent documents, written at a time when the religious horizon of Israel had been broadened, when catholic ideas and feelings had more and more weakened the early particularism, there is more frequent reference to the love of God for all peoples and even for all creatures. What a difference, for example, between the book of Jonah, which promises forgiveness to a heathen nation and an enemy of Israel, and the numerous narratives of the old documents, in which Jehovah commands the destruction of idolatrous

[1] Gen. xxiv. 12, 27 ; xxxii. 10 ; Ex. iii. 7 ff. ; xxii. 27 ; Num. xiv. 18–20 ; Deut. xxxii. 6 ff. ; xxxiii. 3 ; comp. 2 Sam. xxiv. 14.

[2] Ex. xx. 5 f. ; xxxiv. 6 f.

peoples without pity or mercy! Great progress was, with time, made on this subject in the religious conceptions of Israel. It is especially the psalms in which there is reference to the love of God that extends not only to Israel or the faithful, but to all creatures. They say in so many words that the earth is full of the goodness of God,[1] and that his mercy endures forever.[2]

2. *Metaphysical Attributes.* — In giving to this rubric the above title we do not wish to be understood as assuming, contrary to our previous assertions, that metaphysics was cultivated in Israel. In distinguishing the metaphysical from the moral attributes of God, we simply conform to modern parlance, make a distinction unknown to the Old Testament. We shall see, in fact, that the Israelites never dwelt on these attributes with a speculative or metaphysical, but only with a religious and practical, interest. Though since theologians, Jewish and Christian, have believed that biblical truth could best be expressed by a transcendental dogmatics, a speculative metaphysics, this is utterly foreign to the essentially religious and practical spirit of Israelitish prophetism, the principles of which we are now discussing.

The metaphysical attribute that takes precedence of all the others, and is most frequently mentioned in the Old Testament, is the *power* of God. It is denoted by the names *El* and *Shadday*, above noticed, which we find in the oldest documents. Of old the Israelites regarded their God as a strong and powerful God, able to protect his people, and also, in case of disobedience, to punish them. The old songs, Jud. v., Ex. xv.,

[1] Ps. xxxiii. 5; civ. 24; cxix. 64. [2] Ps. cxxxvi. and elsewhere.

Deut. xxxii., 1 Sam. ii., celebrate chiefly the power of Jehovah as it is manifested in favor of Israel. The grand deeds, the miracles, by which God delivered the children of Israel from bondage in Egypt,[1] reveal his power.[2] It appears also in the narratives of creation,[3] the deluge,[4] the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah,[5] the victories won over the Canaanitish peoples,[6] and in all the narratives of this kind. Except in Gen. xviii. 14, however, one hardly finds in the oldest documents an assertion of the absolute power or the omnipotence of God. On the other hand, nothing indicates that this power was limited as were the other attributes of God. This attribute, which particularly concerns men, in their state of dependence, the Israelites took peculiar delight in asserting and developing from ancient times.

In our period we find on every page of the biblical books the assertion that Jehovah has absolute power over the world, that he can do what he will. The passages of this sort are so numerous and so familiar that it is superfluous to cite any of them.

A God so powerful as that of Israel, the author of all the wonders of creation and history that are described in the Old Testament, would naturally appear as a real and *living* God. Passages both earlier and later, in fact, represent him as such, especially in formulæ[7] for oaths.

One of the passages that we have just cited says not

[1] Ex. vii. ff. [2] Ex. ix. 16; iii. 19 f. [3] Gen. i. f.
[4] Gen. vi. ff. [5] Gen. xix. [6] Josh. i. ff.
[7] Gen. xvi. 13 f.; Num. xiv. 21, 28; Josh. iii. 10; 1 Sam. xiv. 39, 45; xvii. 26, 36; etc.; Hos. i. 10; iv. 15; Deut. xxxii. 40; v. 26; Jer. iv. 2; v. 2; x. 10; etc.

only that God is living, but that he forever is.[1] The earliest passages that assert the *eternity* of God are Ex. xv. 18, which declares that Jehovah will reign forever, and Gen. xxi. 33, in which Jehovah is called everlasting God. It should, however, be observed that the word *olam*, which in these passages and elsewhere is rendered *everlasting*, has a more restricted significance than the English word. It denotes simply an unlimited or very long time. In our period, then, for want of a better term, the word *olam* is still sometimes used to denote the eternity of God ;[2] we notice serious efforts to express this idea more adequately. Thus they say that God is he who existed before, and will exist after, all else, that he is the first and the last, that his years have no end, and so forth.[3]

The omnipotence of God implies his *omnipresence.* We have already noticed the limitations that some narratives put upon this attribute of God. It is, however, proper to say here that, even in document A, there are narratives that presuppose the divine omnipresence, if not in the strict, dogmatic sense, at least in the religious signification of the word ; *viz.* that wherever there are believing souls, they are assured of the presence of God. Thus Eliezer can address his prayer to the God of Abraham in Mesopotamia.[4] Jacob, when he sets out for that country, receives the express assurance that God will be with him and keep him wherever he goes.[5] And this promise is realized in the subsequent life of

[1] Deut. xxxii. 40.

[2] Jer. x. 10 ; Isa. xl. 28 ; Lam. v. 19 ; Ps. xciii. 2.

[3] Job xxxvi. 26 ; Isa. xli. 4 ; xliii. 10 ; xliv. 6 ; xlviii. 12 ; Ps. lv. 19 ; xc. 1–4 ; cii. 24, 27 ; comp. Dan. vii. 13, 22.

[4] Gen. xxiv. 12 ff.

[5] Gen. xxviii. 15.

the patriarch.[1] Since document A teaches that God created all things,[2] the idea that he presides over everything must be of early date. In any case, beginning with our period, the omnipotence of God was actually asserted, though not by any means in philosophical language.[3] We should not, then, take literally all the passages that say that God dwells in heaven, or those that give us to understand that he dwells in the sanctuary, at Jerusalem, on the holy mountain. Though the people may have long cherished gross ideas on this subject, the prophets rose above these imperfect conceptions. Among them the idea of the presence of God in the sanctuary harmonized with that of his omnipresence, as the idea that God is the ruler of all nations did with that of Israel's peculiar relation to him. From their point of view it was said both that God dwelt in heaven and that the highest heavens could not contain him,[4] that he dwelt in Zion and in heaven.[5]

With the omnipresence of God is very naturally connected his *omniscience*. According to document A, God knew the fall of Adam and Eve,[6] the crime of Cain,[7] the corruption of the human race that caused the deluge,[8] the depravity of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah,[9] the oppression of the children of Israel,[10] etc. This document everywhere takes for granted that prayers when addressed to God can be heard ; that therefore God hears. It says also that God knows the

[1] Gen. xxxi. 49–54 ; xxxii. 1 f., 9 ff. ; xxxiii. 20 ; xlvi. 4.

[2] Gen. ii. 4 ff.

[3] Amos ix. 2–4 ; Deut. iv. 39 ; Hab. iii. 3 ; Jer. xxiii. 23 f. ; Isa. lxvi. 1 ; 1 Kings viii. 27 ; Ps. cxxxix. 7–10 ; comp. Ob. 4.

[4] 1 Kings viii. 27 ff. [5] Ps. xiv. 2, 7 ; xx. 2, 6.

[6] Gen. iii. [7] Gen. iv. [8] Gen. vi. ff. [9] Gen. xviii. f.

[10] Ex. iii.

thoughts of men.[1] It attributes to him, finally, knowledge of the future.[2] This we find especially in the documents of our period:[3] witness the numerous predictions made by the prophets in the name of God, and the frequent assertion that God knows all things, even the most secret.[4]

An attribute of God that is not mentioned before this period, but recurs often enough hereafter, along with the power of God as it appears in nature, is his *wisdom*.[5] The reason why the idea of this attribute was attained so late is easy enough to understand. It was necessary "that observation and reflection should first give to man a comparatively exact knowledge of nature before he could grasp the order, the harmony, that reign in it, and comprehend that it all has one end, the highest good."[6]

## § 10. CREATION.

We have seen that originally the Israelites saw in Jehovah little more than their king and their protector; that they only gradually rose to the idea that their God was the only true God, creator of heaven and earth.

Even document A contains a narrative of creation.[7]

[1] Gen. vi. 5; comp. vii. 1; 1 Sam. ii. 3; xvi. 7; 2 Sam. vii. 20.

[2] Gen. xi. 3; xv. 13 ff.; xviii. 14, 18; xxviii. 14; Ex. iv. 14; xi. 1 ff.; etc.

[3] Isa. xlii. 9; xliii. 9–12; xlvi. 10; xlviii. 4 f.

[4] Amos iv. 13; v. 12; Hos. v. 3; Zech. ix. 1; Job xi. 7–9, 11; xxvi. 5 f.; xxxiv. 21 f.; Jer. i. 5; xi. 20; xii. 3; xv. 15; etc.; Ezek. xi. 5; Isa. xxxvii. 28; 1 Kings viii. 39; Prov. v. 21; xv. 3, 11; etc.

[5] Jer. x. 12; li. 15 f.; Isa. xxxi. 2; xl. 12–14; Job ix. 4–10; xii. 13, 16; xxviii. 12–27; xxxviii.–xli.; Prov. iii. 19 f.; viii. 22 ff.; Ps. xix.; civ. 24; Gen. i. 31.

[6] Haag, *Théol. Bibl.*, p. 312.

[7] Gen. ii. 4 *b*–25.

This narrative declares that Jehovah God made the earth and the heavens.[1] On the whole it presents naïvely, but not unattractively, the early conceptions of Israel on this subject. It tells us that, before the creation of man, there were no plants on the earth, because God had not yet caused it to rain;[2] that God formed man of the dust of the earth and breathed into his nostrils to make him a living being;[3] that from the earth he also took the animals.[4] The formation of woman from a rib of man is clearly the most original feature of this whole fragment.[5]

Except in this narrative, and a few other passages,[6] there is little reference to creation and God the Creator in early Hebrew literature. It is necessary to come down as far as the time of the Exile to find passages of any number bearing on this subject.[7] The book of Job several times refers to it.[8] It is also mentioned in the famous passage, Prov. viii. 22 ff., and especially in a number of psalms.[9] But the most remarkable passage relating to it is the narrative of creation in document C.[10]

Upon comparing this latter narrative with that of document A, it will easily be perceived that it dates from a time when religious thought was more developed. God does not here act after the manner of men, fashioning the clay of the earth into man and animals, getting woman from a rib of man, and watering the earth

[1] *v.* 4. [2] *v.* 5. [3] *v.* 7. [4] *v.* 19. [5] *vv.* 21 f.

[6] Gen. xiv. 19, 22; Ex. iv. 11; Amos iv. 13; v. 8; Isa. xxix. 16.

[7] Jer. x. 12 f., 16; xxvii. 5; xxxi. 35; xxxii. 17; li. 15, 19; Zech. xii. 1; Isa. xxxvii. 16; xl. 28; xlii. 5; xliv. 24; xlv. 9, 12, 18; xlviii. 13; li. 13; lxvi. 2; Jon. i. 9.

[8] x. 8 f.; xxvi. 7 ff.; xxviii. 25 f.; xxxvi. 3; xxxviii. 4 ff.

[9] viii.; xix. 1 ff.; xxiv. 1 f.; xxxiii. 6–9; etc. [10] Gen. i.

with rain to make the plants grow. He proceeds as a real creator: "God said: Let the light be! And light was." This is also the case with the other acts of creation.[1] The simple creative word of God instantly calls everything into existence. The sublime beauty of this conception has always been admired. In addition to the word of God it is the spirit of God that contributes to the realization of the work of creation.[2] Elsewhere the spirit,[3] the word,[4] and the wisdom[5] of God are mentioned as the agents of creation.

The question whether the world was produced from nothing or whether matter existed from all eternity, is not touched, much less solved, in the canonical books of the Old Testament. Creation *ex nihilo* is first taught, 2 Macc. vii. 28, and it is not absolutely certain that it is the thought of that passage.[6] Wisdom says expressly that God made the world of formless matter,[7] probably basing this statement upon Gen. i. 1. The creation of matter by the almighty word of God, however, agrees better with the character of Gen. i. than the opposite conception.[8] If the question concerning creation *ex nihilo* had been put, or had presented itself, to the author of document C, he would certainly have answered it in the affirmative, and what is true of him is true also of the prophets and the other sacred writers. There was, from this time onward, too strong a persua-

[1] *vv.* 3, 6, 11, 14, 20, 24, 26. [2] *v.* 2.

[3] Job xxxiii. 4; xxxiv. 14 f.; Ps. xxxiii. 6; civ. 29 f.; comp. Gen. ii. 7.

[4] Ps. xxxiii. 6, 9; cvii. 20; cxlvii. 15, 18; cxlviii. 5.

[5] Job xxviii. 23 ff.; Prov. viii. 22 ff.

[6] Grimm, *i.l.* [7] xi. 18.

[8] Schultz, II. pp. 184 ff.; comp. Reuss, *Geschichte*, p. 320.

sion of the omnipotence of God to admit of the least limitation to it.[1] Even document A declares that nothing is impossible with God.[2] If the question under discussion was not answered in the way indicated, it is because it was not proposed. The prophets generally said little about creation. It is the present and the future that engage their attention, not the past, and what interests them almost exclusively in the past is the history of their people. As for the sages in Israel, they gave more attention to practical life than to purely speculative problems.

In our day the attempts have often been made to reconcile the first biblical account of creation with the dicta of science. As for us, we feel ourselves obliged to oppose such attempts. All who make them are forced to wrest the meaning of the Scriptures or the results of science. Thus they are obliged to transform the six days of which the biblical narrative speaks into as many periods, comprising innumerable years. Now one must either imperfectly understand the meaning of the passage or have a defective exegetical conscience to venture to defend such an interpretation. Every impartial exegete admits that reference is here made merely to six ordinary days followed by a real Israelitish Sabbath. The end of the narrative[3] shows clearly that, in this document, the institution of the week and the Sabbath is connected with the work of creation. It appears also from another passage of the same document.[4] The addition to the decalogue, Ex. xx. 11, —

[1] Comp. Bruch, *Weisheitslehre der Hebräer*, p. 77 ; [Schultz, II. p. 186 f.].

[2] Gen. xviii. 14. [3] Gen. ii. 2 f. [4] Ex. xxxi. 17.

which forms no part of the original text, as is proven by the parallel text, Deut. v., — is also evidently taken from this document. In these passages, copied from Gen. i., there is reference only to six ordinary week-days, hence it may be concluded that in this last there is no reference to anything else. Or rather, all these passages, Gen. i. included, were suggested by the Israelitish week, which existed from the remotest times: a clear proof that, in this narrative, there is reference to six real days. Moreover, the narrative itself sufficiently sustains this interpretation by the expression, six times repeated: "And there was evening, and there was morning."[1] We must say that the idea of seeing anything but six ordinary days in it would never have occurred to any one, if modern science had not demonstrated that the work of creation required for its accomplishment a series of very long periods. There are, moreover, other variations between the biblical account and science.[2]

What should one do in such a state of things? We must begin by respecting the exact sense of the biblical text, on the one hand, and the results of science on the other, and admit that the Bible is not and does not pretend to be either a scientific manual or a system of infallible dogmas. Its value is neither theological nor scientific, but religious. This is true also of the first chapter of Genesis. An account that says that God worked six days at the task of creation and rested the seventh like a laborer, is far from perfect from the theological as well as for the scientific point of view. But

[1] Gen. i. 5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 26.

[2] Dillmann, *Genesis*, pp. 10 ff.; [Dods, *Book of Genesis*, pp. 3 f.].

this simple and naïve account has a real religious value, because it represents to us the world as the work of an almighty God, who has only to speak to bring everything into existence. The religious soul will always require such a God; it will always thirst for a living God.[1] It will, therefore, find ample satisfaction in this account despite its dogmatic and scientific imperfections, which shock only those who cherish a false idea of the Bible.

Most civilized peoples of antiquity have, among their traditions, accounts of creation, and some of these accounts are very analogous to those of the Bible.[2] They all seem to rest on a common tradition. The biblical accounts, however, excel the others, as the religion of Israel excels the other religions of antiquity. We therefore fully agree with the conclusion with which Riehm closes his article on creation: "Instead of making useless and fruitless efforts to reconcile the account of creation with the results of science, it would be much better to compare carefully all the cosmogonies of antiquity for the sake of placing in a clear light the religious value of the biblical account of creation."[3]

## § 11. PROVIDENCE.

It is only necessary to glance through the Old Testament to be impressed that the dominant idea, recurring on every page, is that Jehovah directs every-

[1] Ps. xlii. 2; lxxxiv. 2.

[2] See Dillmann, *Genesis*, pp. 10 f.; [Lenormant, *Beginnings of History*, pp. 47 ff.].

[3] *Handwörterbuch*, p. 1416; [Dods, *Genesis*, pp. 1 f.].

thing in the world and more particularly in the history of his people. He appears to the first men and to the patriarchs to regulate all that concerns them. He interferes in history, to save his people from Egyptian slavery, to lead them across the desert, to bring them into the land of Canaan, to protect them against their enemies, to reclaim them from their wanderings, to punish them for their unfaithfulness. He places over them Moses, to whom he speaks continually, revealing to him, even to the least details, the laws, civil and religious, that Israel are to obey. Joshua, who succeeds Moses by the express command of God, is also divinely directed in all his undertakings. After Joshua there are judges, raised up and directed by the spirit of God, who govern the various tribes of Israel. Then the kings or anointed ones of Jehovah are placed over the whole people, also the prophets, those servants of God *par excellence*, who always speak and act under the influence of divine inspiration. In a word, from the remotest antiquity the people Israel felt themselves constantly governed and directed in all things by Jehovah himself or by powers established and inspired by him. From this point of view providence becomes identical with the theocratic government of Israel. For a long time, doubtless, the Israelites had no other conception of divine providence.

Afterwards, however, they rose to the idea that Jehovah directs, as sovereign lord, all the peoples of the earth.[1] Nevertheless, Israel always remained the centre of the world's history, and the other peoples were, in

[1] Amos i. 2, 1 ff.; ix. 7; Zech. ix. 1 ff.; Mic. iv. 11 ff.; Isa. xv. ff.; Jer. xlvi. ff.; Ezek. xxv. ff.; 2 Kings v. 1; Deut. ii. 22.

reality, only instruments employed by Jehovah to execute his purposes toward his chosen people. The narrow particularism, inherent in the whole old covenant, was only partially outgrown by the prophets; none of them rose to strict universalism, as more than one consideration will show.

What idea was current in Israel of the relation existing between divine providence and human freedom? It is certain that the Old Testament allows great play to the freedom of man. The legal *régime* leaves to each the choice between life and death, between blessing and cursing. What Deut. xxx. 15–20 says on this subject is but an admirable *résumé* of the whole Old Testament. The efficacy of prayer is also everywhere recognized; that is to say, it is admitted that the will of man is taken into consideration by God, that it influences the divine will.[1]

Though, on the one hand, the Old Testament takes for granted or asserts the reality of human freedom, on the other, it teaches just as categorically the absolute dependence of man with respect to God. According to this doctrine everything in the history of peoples and individuals depends upon God and his providential direction; there is no place for chance.[2] Nothing happens except the Lord decrees it.[3] Even when the lot is cast, the decision comes from God.[4] Human actions are no exception to the general rule. They also are absolutely dependent upon God. Man plans his path, but

[1] See especially Gen. xviii. 23 ff.; Ex. xxxii. 10–14; Num. xiv. 12–20; Deut. ix. 25 ff.; 2 Kings xx. 1–11.

[2] Ex. xxi. 13.

[3] Lam. iii. 27.

[4] Prov. xvi. 33.

it is God who directs his course.[1] Man is really in the hands of God as the clay is in the hands of the potter.[2]

Divine providence, in thus directing the events of history, uses all human actions for the realization of its purposes. This appears very clearly in the history of the patriarchs, especially in that of Jacob, and most clearly in that of Joseph. It is expressly said that the evil that his brothers sought to do to Joseph was providential, and that God would and could transform it into good.[3] The same point of view is maintained in the later history. The cruel edict of Pharaoh against the Hebrew children, the exposure of Moses on the Nile, his education at the Egyptian court, the murder that he commits, his flight and his sojourn in the desert, — everything helps to prepare him for his lofty mission as deliverer of the children of Israel. All the persecutions directed against David only serve to bring him more surely to the throne. Balaam is forced to bless Israel against his will. Jonah seeks in vain to avoid the mission that God has entrusted to him. The mighty enemies of Israel, in spite of their ambition and their proud designs, are only instruments in the hands of God in fulfilling his will and his decrees, in punishing or delivering his people.[4] God, indeed, is able to do anything, and there are no obstacles to his plans.[5]

[1] Prov. xvi. 1, 9; xix. 21; xx. 24; xxi. 1; Jer. x. 23; Isa. xxvi. 12.

[2] Isa. xxix. 16; xlv. 9 f.; lxiv. 8; Jer. xviii. 6.

[3] Gen. xlv. 5, 7 f.; l. 20.

[4] Ex. ix. 15 f.; xi. 9; Isa. x. 5 ff.; xiv. 12 ff.; xli. 2 ff., 25 ff.; xlv. 1 ff.; Jer. l. 2 ff., 8 ff., 41 ff.; li. 11 ff., 20 ff., 27 ff.; Hab. i. 5 ff.; Zech. xiv. 2.

[5] Job xlii. 2; comp. Prov. xxi. 31; Ps. cxviii. 22 f.

Thus he laughs at the powerful of the earth, who dare to oppose him, him and his anointed.[1]

It appears from the preceding discussion, that God is the author both of the happiness and the unhappiness of peoples and individuals. Such is the teaching of the whole Old Testament, especially of the historical and prophetical books. But what best shows how far the Old Testament carries its assertion of the absolute sovereignty of God, is the fact that it represents God as the author of moral evil. It is he, in fact, who hardens the hearts of Pharaoh[2] and the Egyptians,[3] of Sihon[4] and the Canaanites;[5] it is he who excites discord between Abimelech and the citizens of Shechem,[6] who impels the sons of Eli to despise the exhortations of their father,[7] who sends an evil spirit upon Saul,[8] who incites David against the Israelites and leads him to take a forbidden census;[9] finally, it is he who causes Rehoboam to deny the just demands of the people,[10] who deceives the prophets of Israel by a lying spirit,[11] who prevents the people from seeing, hearing, understanding his will, lest they should turn,[12] who is a stumbling-block and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem,[13] who puts into the Egyptian chiefs an erring spirit.[14]

The absolute dependence, then, of man as respects

[1] Ps. ii. 1 ff.; comp. xxxiii. 10.

[2] Ex. iv. 21; vii. 3; ix. 12; x. 1, 20, 27; xiv. 4, 8.

[3] Ex. xiv. 17. [4] Deut. ii. 30. [5] Josh. xi. 20. [6] Jud. ix. 23.

[7] 1 Sam. ii. 25. [8] 1 Sam. xvi. 14 f.; xviii. 10; xix. 9.

[9] 2 Sam. xxiv.; comp. 1 Sam. xxvi. 19.

[10] 1 Kings xii. 15. [11] 1 Kings xxii. 19–23.

[12] Isa. vi. 9 f.; comp. xxix. 10–12; lxiii. 17; Deut. xxix. 4; Job xii. 16; xvii. 4. [13] Isa. viii. 14.

[14] Isa. xix. 13 f.; comp. Job xii. 24 f.

God is asserted in the Old Testament, as well as his freedom and responsibility. Let no one try to reconcile these two contradictory assertions. The eminently practical character of the religion of Israel made it possible to forego a solution, which, for that matter, has never yet been discovered, and which evidently transcends the powers of the human reason. The moral consciousness will always assert human freedom, and the religious consciousness the absolute sovereignty of God. Philosophers and dogmatists may, in turn, deny the one or the other; morality will always protest against the denial of our freedom, and piety against that of the supreme sovereignty of God, and they will thus vindicate the general standpoint of the Old Testament, which in the place of two negations presents two affirmations.

As God orders and directs absolutely every event in history, in the lives of peoples and individuals, so also he governs the world that he has created, and all the phenomena that appear in it. Men of primitive times, being destitute of all scientific training, knew nothing or next to nothing of the laws of nature that regulate the course and the maintenance of the world. It is late, therefore, before there appear in the Old Testament passages in which these laws are mentioned.[1] We know of only one comparatively early passage that speaks of the regular course of the world;[2] and this makes it depend directly upon the will of God and not upon laws established by him. Even in more recent

[1] Jer. v. 22; xxxi. 35 f.; xxxiii. 20, 25; Job xiv. 5; xxxviii. 10; Gen. i. 11, 22, 28 f.; ix. 1, 8–17; Ps. civ. 9; cxlviii. 6.

[2] Gen. viii. 22.

documents the passages that speak of the laws of nature are rare. The prevailing tendency of the religion of Israel, not only at the time when the laws of nature were unknown, but even afterwards, when they were to some extent recognized, was to overlook these laws and refer everything that happened to the immediate action of God. To the Israelite in all ages, the creature is absolutely and directly dependent upon the Creator. The spirit, the word, and the wisdom of God, that called them into existence, can also at any moment bring them to naught; God has only to withdraw his breath, and they die; or emit it, and everything is renewed.[1] Before the breath, the almighty and creative spirit of God, all creatures are but flesh, *i.e.* fragile beings.[2] God is the lord of the spirits of all flesh, causing life and death.[3]

It is God who produces and regulates all the phenomena of animate and inanimate nature, who grants or denies food to all that lives, who causes plenty or scarcity.[4] This side of divine providence is very well described in a series of psalms,[5] and after a magnificent fashion in the book of Job.[6] The book of Jonah also makes prominent this idea, that God regulates everything

[1] Gen. vi. 3; Job xxvii. 3; xxxiv. 14 f.; Ps. xxxiii. 9; civ. 27–30; cxlvii. 15–18.

[2] Gen. vi. 3, 13; Isa. xxxi. 3; xl. 6–8.

[3] Num. xvi. 22; xxvii. 16; 1 Sam. ii. 6; Isa. xxxviii.

[4] Amos iv. 6 ff.; v. 8 f.; viii. 9; Hos. ii. 21; Zech. x. 1; Isa. v. 6; xix. 5 ff.; xxx. 20, 23 ff.; Neh. i. 4; Jer. iii. 3; v. 42; x. 13; Deut. xi. 13 ff.; xxviii. 1 ff., 15 ff.; etc.

[5] lxv. 9–13; civ. 1 ff., 13 ff., 21, 27 ff.; cxxxvi. 25; cxlv. 15 f.; cxlvii. 9, 15–18.

[6] xxxvi. 27–31; xxxvii. 2–13; xxxviii.–xli.

in nature as he pleases.[1] God can make barrenness fruitful.[2] He covers with the waters of the deluge the face of the earth; after the deluge he places the rainbow in the clouds; he causes it to rain brimstone and fire upon Sodom and Gomorrah; he sends plagues of every sort upon Egypt; he gives manna and quails to the people Israel. More than this, God can transform the entire universe.[3] He has only to speak to attain his purposes; for his word does not return to him without effect; it executes his will, and fulfils his intentions.[4]

The best proof that God is not bound by the laws of nature, but can do whatever he will, is the unlimited ability to perform miracles attributed to him. On this point the story of Moses, and that of Elijah and Elisha, are especially instructive. The Israelites accepted without hesitation the most extraordinary miracles. They believed that Balaam's ass spoke,[5] that the walls of Jericho fell at the noise of the trumpets and the shouts of the people Israel,[6] that the sun and the moon stood still at the command of Joshua,[7] that the sun even retraced its course in answer to the prayer of Isaiah,[8] that Elisha made a piece of iron that had fallen into the water float.[9] They also attributed a degree of miraculous power to the Egyptian magicians,[10] but a less degree than that possessed by Moses.[11] Finally, they thought that false prophets possessed the gift of working miracles.[12]

[1] i. 4; ii. 1, 11; iv. 6–8.
[2] Gen. xviii. 9 ff.; xvii. 17 ff.; xxi. 1 f.; xxv. 21; xxx. 2, 8.
[3] Ps. cii. 26. [4] Isa. lv. 11. [5] Num. xxii. 28. [6] Josh. vi.
[7] Josh. x. 12 f. [8] 2 Kings xx. 8–11.
[9] 2 Kings vi. 6. [10] Ex. vii. 11 f., 22; viii. 3.
[11] Ex. viii. 14; ix. 11. [12] Deut. xiii. 2 ff.

On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that the Israelites saw miracles in the ordinary course of nature and history. The same term that denotes wonders of nature also denotes miracles properly so called.[1]

Oehler, therefore, could justly say that, from the standpoint of the Old Testament, "miracles do not differ qualitatively from the customary operations of God in nature and history."[2] The Israelite saw too clearly everywhere the direct activity of God to make an essential distinction between the wonders of nature and miracles in the strict sense of this term.

## § 12. THE MANIFESTATION OF GOD IN THE WORLD.

The God of Israel is an absolutely transcendent God. The Israelites did not have the idea of the immanence of God. Jehovah hovers over the earth; he is perfectly distinct from it, therefore he is essentially holy; holiness, when applied to God, denotes his exaltation, his transcendence. Hence God cannot enter into direct relations with the world; he needs mediators. Neither is he able to make himself known to men in his glorious essence and majesty; he can reveal himself to them only in part.

Though the possibility and the reality of a continued revelation of God was believed in Israel, they did not claim to possess a perfect and adequate knowledge of him. Moses himself, though peculiarly blessed in this respect, in that God shows himself to him and speaks

[1] Comp. Job v. 9 f.; Ps. lxxxix. 5; cvii. 8 f., 23 f.; cxxxix. 13 f., with Ex. iii. 20; xv. 11; xxxiv. 10; Josh. iii. 5; Jud. vi. 13.

[2] § 64.

to him more directly than to any other prophet,[1] is not allowed to see God face to face; he can see him only from behind;[2] in fact, none among men can see the face of God and live.[3] This view, which dates from the first period, is maintained in the periods following.[4] Man could not, then, fully see, know, comprehend God.[5] Even the God revealed remains a God more or less hidden.[6] Though the things revealed are for man, there are also hidden things that God alone knows.[7] A distinction must, then, be made between the unfathomable essence of God and what a frail mortal can know of him, between God in himself and his appearance in the world.

## I. *The Glory, the Name, the Face, the Malakh of God.*

1. *The Glory of God.* — What man may know of God is his glory. The glory of God is precisely the side of divinity that is accessible to man, that is revealed to him. It may justly be said that the holiness of God is his glory hidden, and the glory of God his holiness revealed.[8] It might also be said that the holi-

[1] Num. xii. 6–8; Ex. xxxiv. 28–35; xxxiii. 11; xxiv. 2, 12–18; xix. 20 ff.

[2] Ex. xxxiii. 20–33.

[3] Ex. xxxiii. 20; xx. 19; xix. 21–24; iii. 6; Jud. vi. 22 f.; xiii. 22; 1 Sam. vi. 19 f.; 2 Sam. vi. 6 ff.

[4] Isa. vi. 5; Deut. iv. 33; v. 23 ff.; xviii. 16; Lev. xvi. 2, 13; comp. Ex. xxviii. 35; xxx. 21; Num. iv. 19 f.

[5] Isa. xl. 28; Job xlii. 1 ff.; xxxviii. f.; xxxvii. 15 ff.; xxxvi. 26; xxvi. 14; Prov. xxx. 2–4.

[6] Isa. xlv. 15; comp. Prov. xxv. 2.

[7] Deut. xxix. 29.

[8] Baudissin, *Studien*, II. p. 107.

ness of God is his inaccessible transcendence, while his glory is his visible manifestation in the world.

It may be supposed that the glory of God appeared to the Israelitish imagination as a consuming fire and as a dazzling light, and that this more or less material conception was originally suggested by the fire and the light of the tempest; which is the more probable since a cloud is often represented as the vehicle of God's glory. Further evidence is found in numerous passages taken from documents of all periods.[1] That God appeared as a consuming fire is surely the reason why it was feared that death would be the penalty of approaching him or seeing his face. That he appeared as a dazzling light is the reason why no one dared look upon his face,[2] and that those who, like Moses, had seen but a part of his glory, retained a reflection of it that dazzled other mortals.[3]

It is apparent from a large number of the passages cited that the glory of God is, as we have already said, the side of divinity that appears and manifests itself to men. When Moses was invited by Jehovah to ascend to him on Mount Sinai, he there saw the glory of God.[4] On another occasion Moses entreated Jehovah that he might see his glory, and this favor was granted him.[5] It is said that the Israelites saw the glory of God, and

[1] Ex. iii. 2; xiii. 21 f.; xvi. 10; xix. 16 ff.; xxiv. 15 ff.; xl. 34 f.; Lev. ix. 6, 23 f.; Num. xvi. 42; Deut. iv. 12, 15, 24, 33, 36; v. 22 ff.; ix. 3; xviii. 16; xxxii. 22; xxxiii. 2; 1 Kings viii. 10 f.; 2 Chron. v. 14; vii. 1–3; Isa. x. 17; xxx. 27, 30, 33; xxxiii. 14; lx. 1 f., 19 f.; Zeph. ii. 2; iii. 8; Nah. i. 6; Hab. iii. 3 f.; Ezek. i. 4, 27 f.; viii. 1 f.; x. 4; xliii. 2; Mal. iii. 2; Ps. xviii. 7 ff.; xxi. 9; l. 3; Dan. vii. 9 f.

[2] Ex. xxxiii. 20–23; Isa. vi. 2; 1 Kings xix. 13.

[3] Ex. xxxiv. 29–35. [4] Ex. xxiv. 16 f. [5] Ex. xxxiii. 18–22.

that all the earth is, or shall be, filled with it.[1] All manifestations of the divine activity in history and in nature, in his judgments and in his benefits, may be regarded as manifestations of his glory.[2]

From Ezekiel onward, the glory of God is connected with the sanctuary. The prophet, having seen it for the first time at Chebar, resplendent as the rainbow,[3] afterwards saw it on its way to the temple, which was filled with a cloud; even the court shone with the glory of Jehovah.[4] When he had his vision of the restored temple, Ezekiel also saw the glory of the God of Israel approach from the east and enter the temple, which was filled with it, by the eastern door.[5] At the dedication of the temple of Solomon the cloud and the glory of God filled the structure.[6] According to document C, the tabernacle of the desert was hallowed in the same way;[7] and when Aaron, who had just been consecrated, offered the first sacrifices, the glory of God appeared to all the people; a fire burst from the presence of Jehovah and consumed the burnt offering and the fat on the altar.[8] According to the same document, the divine glory appeared at various times during the journey in the desert, to rebuke the murmurs and revolts of the people.[9] It appears from all this that the sanctuary of Israel was regarded as the place where the glory of Jehovah dwelt.[10]

[1] Num. xiv. 21 f.; Isa. vi. 3; Hab. ii. 14.
[2] Deut. v. 24; Ezek. xxxix. 21; Isa. xxxv. 2; xl. 5; Ps. xix. 1 f.; lvii. 5, 11; xcvi. 3.
[3] Ezek. i. 28; iii. 23.
[4] Ezek. x. 4.
[5] Ezek. xliii. 1–5.
[6] 1 Kings viii. 10 f.; 2 Chron. v. 14; vii. 1–3.
[7] Ex. xl. 34 f.; xxix. 43.
[8] Lev. ix. 6; 23 f.
[9] Ex. xvi. 7, 10; Num. xiv. 10; xvi. 19, 42.
[10] Ps. xxvi. 8; comp. lxiii. 7.

2. *The Name of God.* — The name of God is very analogous to his glory. Sometimes the two terms seem to be synonymous. Deutero-Isaiah, for example, says: "The name of Jehovah shall be feared from the west, and his glory from the rising of the sun."[1] And a psalmist exclaims: "The nations shall fear the name of Jehovah, and all the kings of the earth thy glory!"[2] As the glory of God is especially connected with the sanctuary, so is his name.[3] The name of God then, like his glory, denotes his peculiar presence.

We find also in the mouth of Jehovah these expressions as synonymous: "For the sake of my name" and "for my own sake."[4] Jeremiah says both that Jehovah swears by himself,[5] and that he swears by his name.[6] Isaiah makes Jehovah say: "They shall sanctify my name, they shall sanctify the Holy One of Jacob."[7] According to deutero-Isaiah, to trust in the name of Jehovah and to lean upon God are one and the same thing.[8] Elsewhere Jehovah and his name are placed in parallelism as having the same signification.[9] Since the name of God, like his glory, is what man may know of the Deity, and since the Old Testament speaks exclusively of God as revealed, known, the identification of Jehovah and his name is very natural.

This identification seems also to be of very early date. According to document A, Jehovah says to Israel, after

[1] Isa. lix. 19; comp. xlii. 8; xliii. 7. [2] Ps. cii. 16.

[3] 2 Sam. vii. 13; Isa. xviii. 7; Jer. vii. 12; Deut. xii. 5, 11; xiv. 23; xvi. 6, 11; 1 Kings viii. 29; ix. 3; 2 Kings xxi. 4, 7; xxiii. 27.

[4] Isa. xlviii. 9, 11. [5] xxii. 5; xlix. 13. [6] xliv. 26. [7] xxix. 23.

[8] Isa. l. 10.

[9] Isa. lii. 6; lxiv. 1; Ps. lxxvi. 1; lxxxvi. 12; ciii. 1; cxlv. 1 f.; cxlviii. 1–5.

the promulgation of the law, that he will send an angel before them to protect them and bring them to the land of Canaan, and adds that his name shall be in this angel.[1] Now Reuss translates "my name" here simply "ma personne." In fact, the name of God is here God himself, who will be with Israel to lead, protect, and bless them. In other passages the name of God is God in his various manifestations, whether their object is to protect and bless, or to execute his wrath and his judgments.[2]

As is well known, the prophets often declare that they speak or act in the name of Jehovah, which unquestionably means that they speak or act by his power or authority. In other passages God says that he acts only for the sake of his name, toward men, more especially toward Israel, who are unfaithful and unworthy of divine blessings; that he acts, that he blesses, for the sake of his name, to prevent it from being profaned in the eyes of the nations, and to make it known, to sanctify and glorify it.[3]

In view of all this, Oehler has justly said: "The name of God is not a mere title that God takes by virtue of the divine relations into which he enters with men; it denotes at the same time all that God can reveal of himself, and, if we may be allowed the expression, all that side of the Deity that is turned toward man." And again: "The name of God is every-

[1] Ex. xxiii. 21.

[2] Isa. xxx. 27; xxvi. 8; Jer. x. 6; Mic. v. 4; 1 Kings viii. 42; Prov. xviii. 10; Ps. liv. 1; cxliii. 11.

[3] Ezek. xx. 9, 14, 22, 44; xxxvi. 20-23; Isa. xlviii. 9; 1 Kings viii. 41-43; Ps. xxiii. 3; xxv. 11; xxxi. 3; lxxix. 9; cvi. 8; cix. 21.

where where the presence of the living God is felt and experienced.[1]

3. *The Face of God.* — Another expression that is very analogous to those preceding is the "face of God." It likewise denotes that side of the Deity that is accessible to men, and it also is identified with God.

Jacob, after having maintained the mysterious struggle with God reported by document A, calls the place of this struggle Peni-el, or *Face of God;* for, says he, I have seen God face to face.[2] It is said likewise that God spoke with Moses face to face.[3] According to Ex. xxxiii. 14–16, God promises Moses that his face shall attend the people Israel across the desert. Moses replies to God: "If thy face come not, make us not go up hence. And how shall it be known that I have found favor in thy eyes, I and my people? Shall it not be if thou come with us?" Moses, then, identifies God with his face. Reuss here renders "my face" and "thy face," "ma personne" and "ta personne," and Segond employs simply the personal pronouns "moi-même" and "toi-même." These two scholars translate in the same way Deut. iv. 37, where Moses reminds the people that Jehovah brought them from Egypt by his face and by his great power. According to Lam. iv. 16, the face of God dispersed the Israelites at the destruction of Jerusalem. In Ps. xxi. 9 it is said of Jehovah that he will make his enemies like a glowing furnace on the day when he shows his face. The face of God, then, like his name and his glory, denotes the presence of God, manifesting himself by the protection that he grants or the punishments that he sends to men.

[1] § 56; comp. Schultz, II. pp. 122 ff. [2] Gen. xxxii. 30. [3] Ex. xxxiii. 11.

The analogy between the face of God and the name of God appears also from Num. vi. 25–27, where it is said that in blessing the people Israel in the words: "Jehovah make shine" or "lift his face upon thee," — the high-priest puts the name of Jehovah upon them.

On the contrary, there are two passages that declare that man is not able to see the face of God.[1] This term, therefore, which usually denotes the accessible side of the Deity, here, exceptionally, denotes the invisible side of God.

4. *The Malakh of God.* — As the revealed God is identified with the glory, the name, or the face, of God, so also, in the case of the *malakh*, *i.e.* according to the ordinary translation, the *angel* of God, or of Jehovah. He is mentioned as early as the song of Deborah.[2]

It is easy to satisfy one's self that there exists a close analogy between the angel of God and his face. On the one hand it is said that the angel of God delivered Israel from Egyptian slavery and accompanied them across the desert;[3] on the other, that this was his face.[4] Deutero-Isaiah evidently attempts to combine these two points of view in speaking of the angel of the face of God who saved Israel from all his afflictions.[5]

The analogy that exists between the angel of God and his face perfectly explains the identification of the angel with God himself. It is found in a large number of passages. The *malakh* of Jehovah is mentioned for the first time in the narrative, Gen. xvi. 7–12, where he appears to Hagar. But in *v.* 13, Hagar calls the name

[1] Ex. xxxiii. 20 and 33.
[2] Jud. v. 23.
[3] Ex. xiv. 19; xxiii. 20–23; xxxii. 34; xxxiii. 2; Num. xx. 16.
[4] Ex. xxxiii. 14 f.; Deut. iv. 37.
[5] Isa. lxiii. 9.

of Jehovah, who has spoken to her, *Attah-El-roï*, which means: Thou art a God who sees. There is here, then, an identification of the angel of Jehovah with the name of Jehovah and with Jehovah himself. God and his angel are further identified in the following passages: Gen. xxi. 17–19; xxii. 11–18; xxxi. 11–13; xlviii. 15 f.; Ex. iii. 2–6; Jud. ii. 1 ff.; vi. 11–16, 20–24; Zech. xii. 8. According to Ex. xiv. 19, the angel of God goes before the camp of Israel; according to *vv.* 24 f. and xiii. 21, it is Jehovah himself. Hosea, alluding to the narrative of Genesis that reports the struggle of Jacob with God, says first that the patriarch strove with God, and then adds that he strove with the angel.[1]

There exist, however, passages where God and his *malakh* are distinguished the one from the other as if they were two different persons.[2] In one instance identification and distinction occur in the same narrative. An angel of Jehovah, called also a man of God, appears to the parents of Samson;[3] he is clearly distinguished from Jehovah;[4] and yet, after his disappearance, Manoah says to his wife: "We shall die, for we have seen God."[5]

Theologians have given much attention to the question who the *malakh* of God really is, but they have reached very divergent conclusions. According to some, he is an angel, but not always the same one; according to others, he is always one and the same angel; some even of these latter, attempting a more precise identification, have maintained that he is the archangel Michael

[1] Hos. xii. 3 f.

[2] Gen. xxiv. 7, 40; Num. xxii. 31; 2 Sam. xxiv. 16; Zech. i. 12 f.

[3] Jud. xiii. 3, 6 ff. [4] Jud. xiii. 8 f., 16, 18 f. [5] Jud. xiii. 22.

of the book of Daniel. Some say that he is a created, others that he is an uncreated, being; many, especially in earlier times, have seen in him the *logos*, the second person of the Trinity; others, in modern times, regard him, not as a personal being at all, but simply a temporary appearance of God. Oehler, after having mentioned and rejected all these various solutions, arrives at the conclusion that the passages in which there is reference to the angel of God do not all agree with one another, and that from the standpoint of the Old Testament it is difficult to reach an exact idea who he is. He, therefore, has recourse to the teaching of the New Testament concerning the logos to find an answer to the question.[1]

We think that it is not necessary to go so far to find the solution, but that it is found in the Old Testament itself, more precisely in what we have already learned respecting the glory, the name, and the face of God. These three manifestations are very analogous to the angel of God. This is what strikes one everywhere, when the term is taken in its strict signification. Reuss says on this subject: "The original signification of the word, which is usually translated *angel*, is abstract, and corresponds nearly to the French word *délégation*. God is an invisible, impalpable being, and if it pleases him to bring himself within the comprehension of man, it is not his very essence that the latter grasps; it is a form, a sign, an appearance, a phenomenon; in fine, something that might be said to be separated from the Deity or delegated by it."[2]

[1] § 60.

[2] On Gen. xvi. 7, comp. Dillmann on Ex. iii. 2; [Schultz, II. pp. 221 ff.].

As there exists a close analogy between the angel of God, on the one hand, and his face, his name, his glory, on the other, it is natural that the first should sometimes be identified with God and sometimes distinguished from him; we have shown that the same is the case with respect to the other three manifestations. God appears in the world under various forms. They may be taken for God himself, since man does not know God in any other way. But from a higher standpoint, a distinction must be made between form and substance, between appearance and essence, between God for us and God in himself, between the revealed and the hidden, the visible and the invisible God. The only difference between the angel of God and the other divine manifestations that have been mentioned is that the angel is a personal manifestation; he is not merely a delegation, he becomes, by virtue of his personal character, a delegate. But this is only a formal difference; in substance there is a striking analogy among the various divine manifestations of which we have here spoken.

## II. *Cherubim and Seraphim.*

1. *Cherubim.* — This is the place to speak of the cherubim, whose chief function is to render God visible, and to symbolize his presence.

We read in two parallel passages of some antiquity, 2 Sam. xxii. 11, and Ps. xviii. 10, that Jehovah, appearing in the midst of the tempest, was mounted on a cherub, that he flew and soared on the wings of the wind. Ezekiel saw the glory of Jehovah go up from

the cherubim which had appeared to him in a vision[1] and then rest again upon them.[2]

In chapters i. and x. of his book this prophet gives us a detailed description of the cherubim, and Riehm's *Handwörterbuch*, in art. *Cherubim*, contains a figure corresponding to this description. We leave to archæology the task of discussing details, content to call attention to the fact that the cherubim are composed of four living beings, have a man's, a lion's, a bull's, and an eagle's face apiece, and rest on a fantastic car, that can move in all directions, and that serves as the throne of God and the vehicle of his glory.[3]

This chariot without horses symbolizes the principal attributes of God. Thus the human figure represents the divine intelligence; the lion's, the divine power; the bull's, the generative or creative might of God; finally, the eagle's, his omniscience or his providence. As for the wheels that can turn in all directions, and are covered with eyes,[4] they represent at once the omnipresence and the omniscience of God.

The fact that the cherubim form the throne of God, and are the vehicle of his glory and the symbols of his presence, evidently explains why images of them are found in the sanctuary where Jehovah was supposed more especially to dwell. Two statues of cherubim ten cubits in height were placed in the holy of holies of the temple of Solomon.[5] Their forms were carved on the walls and on certain sacred utensils.[6] They were reproduced on the veil that hid the holy of holies.[7]

[1] ix. 3; x. 4. [2] x. 18 f.; xi. 22. [3] Ezek. i. 4 ff.; x. 1 ff., 9 ff.
[4] Ezek. i. 15 ff.; x. 9 ff. [5] 1 Kings vi. 23–28.
[6] 1 Kings vi. 29–35; vii. 29, 36; 2 Chron. iii. 7. [7] 2 Chron. iii. 14.

According to document C, the Mosaic tabernacle was ornamented in the same fashion.[1] Finally, in the ideal temple of Ezekiel, we again encounter the same thing.[2]

The figures of the cherubim in the temple and the tabernacle have only one face, and therefore differ from the cherubim of Ezekiel, which have four faces; but they also represent the throne of God, and symbolize the presence of God: in Israel Jehovah, in all ages, was imagined as seated between the cherubim or enthroned above them.[3]

The cherubim, finally, take the part of guardians of sacred things. In the sanctuary they cover with their wings the ark of the covenant, where Jehovah is more especially present;[4] they are stationed with spread wings at the entrance of the holy of holies where the ark is kept.[5] Thus they guard the thrice sacred presence of God, and in a sense veil it that nothing unclean or profane may approach it. We likewise see cherubim posted on the east of the Garden of Eden, to guard the way to the tree of life,[6] that sinful man may not approach it. They are, therefore, the guardians of sacred things, the protectors, as Ezekiel calls them.[7]

How did the Israelites come to imagine these strange figures? It is difficult to say. The etymology of the word cherubim is uncertain, hence it cannot greatly aid

[1] Ex. xxv. 18–20; xxxvii. 7–9; xxvi. 1, 31, xxxvi. 8, 35.

[2] Ezek. xli. 17 ff.

[3] 1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2; 2 Kings xix. 15; 1 Chron. xiii. 6; Ex. xxv. 22; Num. vii. 89; Ps. lxxx. 1; xcix. 1.

[4] 1 Kings viii. 6 f.; 1 Chron. xxviii. 18; 2 Chron. v. 7 f.; Ex. xxv. 20; xxxvii. 9.

[5] 1 Kings vi. 27; 2 Chron. iii. xiii.; Ex. xxv. 20; xxxvii. 9.

[6] Gen. iii. 24. [7] xxviii. 14, 16.

in elucidating the subject. What is certain is that analogous conceptions exist among other peoples of antiquity.[1] It is probable that the cherubim, which to the imagination of the Hebrews were real and living beings, a kind of winged monsters, owed their origin to the phenomena of the tempest. The clouds, sometimes black, sometimes bright, chased by the wind, seem to have given rise to the idea that the divine glory, majesty, was being borne by these clouds as by winged beings or a flying chariot. This seems clear from Ps. xviii., which we have already cited, but also from various passages in Ezekiel, where the cherubim are accompanied by a violent wind, thick clouds, great noise, where they are like the lightning, a flashing fire and a brilliant light.[2] Be it also remembered, that according to document A, God appeared to Israel when the law was promulgated, in the midst of the noise, the clouds, and the fire of the tempest.[3] Finally, let it be remembered that the glory of God, of which the cherubim are the vehicle, appeared to the Israelites as a devouring fire, and a dazzling light, as we saw at the beginning of this paragraph.

2. *Seraphim.* — The seraphim are somewhat like the cherubim. There is reference to them, however, in but one passage, Isa. vi. 1–7. The prophet there says: "In the year of King Uzziah's death, I saw the Lord

[1] Dillmann, *Bibel-Lexikon;* and Riehm, *Handwörterbuch,* art. *Cherubim;* [Smith, *Dictionary*, art. *Cherub;* Lenormant, *Beginnings*, pp. 117 ff.].

[2] i. 4, 7, 13 f., 24; iii. 12 f.; x. 2, 4–7; comp. Schultz, II. pp. 229 f.; Dillmann, *Bibel-Lexikon*, p. 509; Riehm, *Handwörterbuch*, pp. 228, 232.

[3] Ex. xix. 9 ff.; xxiv. 15 ff.; comp. Deut. iv. 11.

sitting on a very lofty throne, while the train of his robe filled the temple. Seraphim hovered above him; each of them had six wings; with two of them they covered their faces, with two they covered their feet, and with two they flew. They cried one to another and said: 'Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of hosts! the whole earth is full of his glory.' The doors were shaken to their foundation by the voice as it resounded, and the house was filled with smoke. Then I said: 'Woe is me! I am undone, for I am a man whose lips are unclean, I dwell in the midst of a people whose lips are unclean, and my eyes have seen the King, Jehovah of hosts.' But one of the seraphim flew toward me, holding a glowing stone in his hand, that he had taken with tongs from the altar. He touched my mouth with it and said: 'This hath touched thy lips; thy iniquity is removed and thy sin is expiated.'"

What is the etymology, and what is the signification of the word *seraphim?* What are the seraphim themselves? what form have they, and what is their nature? Finally, what are their functions? These are questions that have been variously answered by various scholars.[1] It must be admitted that, as Schultz remarks, it is difficult to form a perfectly clear idea of the seraphim from the single passage that speaks of them. Reuss, after having rejected the traditional idea, according to which the seraphim were winged angels, adds: "In Hebrew *saraph* is always a serpent, and we know that the serpent played a part in oriental symbolism, as a representative of certain divine attributes (mystery, eternity). We

[1] Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, art. *Seraphim;* Schultz, II. pp. 237 ff.; the commentaries; [Smith, *Dictionary*, art. *Seraphim*].

find it used in figurative representations of God among the Jews.[1] It is not here a question of simple serpents, but of composite forms (like those of Ezekiel's cherubim) that have parts of serpents, birds (wings), and men (hands). These forms, created by the imagination of the author, seem to us grotesque, because we are not accustomed to symbolize abstract ideas such as the divine attributes by hybrid combinations of animal forms. These ideas thus become animate, personal beings, and take their place as a species under the abstract notion of God."[2]

This explanation, simple as it is, seems to us nearer the truth than many more elaborate that have been proposed. It is evident that the seraphim are very analogous to the cherubim of Ezekiel. They both appear to the prophets in visions. Both are of a composite nature. The seraphim, like the cherubim, have wings with which they cover their bodies.[3] The latter, after the fashion of the former, cry: "Blessed be the glory of Jehovah from the place of his abode!"[4] One of them brings glowing coals to a messenger of God, that he may scatter them over the city of Jerusalem.[5] Moreover, we must not try to be too exact or lose sight of the fact that we are dealing with a prophetic vision, which, like so many other visions of the same kind, is important only for the subjective and religious ideas that it expresses. The above considerations show that the cherubim and seraphim are not angels, as has often been thought. Not to speak of other differences, there is this entirely

[1] Num. xxi. 2; 2 Kings xviii. 4.

[2] On Isa. vi. 2, comp. Baudissin, *Studien*, I. pp. 255 ff.

[3] Ezek. i. 11. [4] Ezek. iii. 12. [5] Ezek. x. 2, 6 f.

external distinction, that the former have wings; while the angels, as we shall see, appear throughout the Old Testament in the human form and without wings, and they receive titles that are never given to the cherubim or the seraphim.

### III. *Angels.*

We have seen that the *malakh* of God, though he is generally represented as a personal being, is not a being distinct from God, an angel properly so-called, but a simple appearance in the visible world of the invisible God. The same may be the case every time there is reference to *malakhim*. This is what Reuss, for example, in part maintains.[1] He takes the *malakhim* for veritable angels only in certain passages, like Job iv. 18; xxxiii. 23; Ps. xci. 11; ciii. 20; cxlviii. 2.[2] Biblical angelology cannot then be based chiefly on the passages in which there is reference to *malakhim*.

An old fragment, Gen. vi. 1–4, speaks of sons of God who take for wives the daughters of men and with them beget the heroes famous in antiquity. Now these sons of God are superhuman beings, veritable angels.[3] The angels are often called sons of God[4] and even Gods.[5] An old passage, Deut. xxxiii. 2, says that when Jehovah appeared from Sinai to the children of Israel, he came forth from the midst of myriads of holy ones. These myriads can only have been celestial beings,

[1] *Gesch.*, §§ 260, 366. [2] *Gesch.*, §§ 236, 482.

[3] See Reuss and Dillmann, [Delitzsch], *il.*; Budde, *Biblische Urgesch.*, p. 3; [Lenormant, *Beginnings*, pp. 295 ff.].

[4] Job i. 6; ii. 1; xxxviii. 7; Ps. xxix. 1; lxxxix. 6; Dan. iii. 25.

[5] Ps. viii. 5; lxxxii. 1.

angels. Still elsewhere, the angels are called holy ones.[1] These various titles that are given to them indicate their exalted nature and character. With respect to their functions they are called servants of God,[2] and also *malakhim*, messengers, as we have seen in some of the passages cited.

A passage in document A speaks of a superhuman man, calling himself the chief of the host of Jehovah, who appeared to Joshua; Joshua cast himself on the ground before him and at his command removed his shoes from his feet, on account of the holiness of the place.[3] The angels are more than once represented as forming an army or a congregation that surrounds the throne of God, to receive his commands and execute them among men.[4] This is their chief office, and it is for this reason that they are called the servants of God, or his messengers. They sing, besides, the praises of God in his heavenly temple.[5]

The angels generally have the human form.[6] In the mythological fragment, Gen. vi. 1–4, they appear even as sensual beings. But as we have seen, they are called gods, sons of God, and holy ones; they were, then, evidently regarded as heavenly beings, partakers of the divine nature, clothed with superior purity.

[1] Zech. xiv. 5; Job v. 1; xv. 15; Ps. lxxxix. 5, 7; Dan. iv. 13, 17, 23; viii. 13.

[2] Job iv. 18; comp. Ps. ciii. 20 f.

[3] Josh. v. 13–15; comp. Ex. iii. 5.

[4] Job i. 6 ff.; ii. 1 ff.; 1 Kings xxii. 19 ff.; 2 Kings vi. 16 f.; Dan. vii. 9 f.; Ps. lxviii. 17; lxxxix. 5–7; ciii. 20 f.; cxlviii. 2.

[5] Job xxxviii. 7; Ps. xxix. 1 f., 9; ciii. 20; cxlviii. 2.

[6] Josh. v. 13 ff.; Ezek. ix. 2 ff.; xl. 3 ff.; xliii. 6; Dan. viii. 15 ff.; x. 16 ff.

According to the book of Job, however, they are not absolutely pure in the eyes of God.[1]

Schultz, among others, claims that the belief in the existence of angels had its origin in the polytheism of the ancient Semites; that, when the idea of a single and sovereign God began to replace and prevail over polytheistic ideas, the numerous divinities that had hitherto been acknowledged, became *elohim* of an inferior order, *bene elohim*, angels. He bases this opinion mainly upon Gen. iii. 22, where God seems to be surrounded by beings similar to himself, and Jud. ix. 9 and 13, which speak of gods, and contain, as it were, echoes of ancient Semitic polytheism.[2]

To this view, "that the angels of the Old Testament are dethroned gods," Oehler, following deWette, replies, that "if such were the case, it is the first books of the Old Testament and not the last in which the angels should appear with functions and names most clearly defined."[3] This reply is far from being decisive; several passages of document A, cited above, in fact prove that, even in early times, the Israelites believed in the existence of a multitude of angels, and placed a chief at the head of this celestial host. What seems, moreover, to confirm the view of Schultz, is the fact that there is nowhere in the Old Testament any reference to the creation of angels; it is fair to conclude that they were regarded as having always existed; according to Job xxxviii. 7, they were present even during the work of creation.[4]

[1] iv. 18; xv. 15.

[2] II. pp. 215 ff.; comp. I. pp. 184 f. and I. chap. vii.

[3] § 61; comp. de Wette, *Archeologie*, § 108. [4] Schultz, II. pp. 227 f.

Since, in poetical language, the forces of nature are sometimes personified and entitled messengers or angels of God,[1] it has been concluded that the angels were originally personifications of the forces of nature, or, according to other passages,[2] extraordinary events sent by God.[3] But it is evident that such a personification presupposes belief in the existence of angels.[4] Most of the passages quoted in favor of this hypothesis, moreover, are of recent date, and therefore lack the evidential value attributed to them.

## IV. *The Spirit of God.*

We have already spoken of the spirit of God in connection with prophetism, creation, and providence. We have recognized its activity in various spheres. We have only to complete what we have said on this subject.

We have seen that the angel and the face of God were with the children of Israel and led them across the desert. Deutero-Isaiah also recalls the fact that the angel of the face of God saved the Israelites from affliction, that he bore them and carried them in olden times; but immediately afterwards he adds that it was Jehovah who, by his holy spirit, accomplished this work of salvation.[5] The book of Nehemiah says that God gave his good spirit to the children of Israel, during their journey in the desert, to make them wise.[6] Haggai

[1] Ps. lxxviii. 49; civ. 4; cxlviii. 8; comp. cxlvii. 15.

[2] Gen. xxi. 17; xxviii. 12; 2 Kings xix. 35; Ps. xxxv. 5 f.; xxxiv. 7; xci. 11.

[3] De Wette, as above. [4] Oehler, as above. [5] Isa. lxiii. 9–14.

[6] ix. 20.

takes a similar standpoint when he makes God say: "I am with you, I remain faithful to the covenant that I made with you when ye came forth from Egypt, and my spirit is in your midst."[1] In these passages the spirit of God is clearly placed on the same level as several of the divine manifestations of which we spoke at the beginning of this chapter. But this is a rare and late standpoint, which is seldom found, especially in the earliest documents.

In the book of Judges, it is often said that the spirit of God, taking possession of the judges, renders them capable of daring projects and heroic actions.[2] According to Gen. xli. 38, Pharaoh, seeing the wonderful wisdom of Joseph, says to his servants: "Shall we find a man like this one, having in him the spirit of God?" This spirit is, in fact, considered the source of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength.[3] It is granted especially to the chiefs of the people Israel, whose duty it is to judge and govern them.[4] It produces fear of God in the heart,[5] regenerates it,[6] and teaches it to do the divine will.[7] According to document C, it is the spirit of God also that gives to the workmen the intelligence and skill necessary to prepare the objects used in the service of the sanctuary, and makes them real artists.[8] All the extraordinary gifts of man, physical and moral, are regarded as produced

[1] ii. 5.

[2] Jud. iii. 10; vi. 34; xi. 29; xiii. 25; xiv. 6, 19; xv. 14; comp. 1 Sam. xi. 6.

[3] Isa. xi. 2; Mic. iii. 8; Job xxxii. 8; Deut. xxxiv. 9.

[4] Num. xi. 17; xxvii. 18; Jud. iii. 10; 1 Sam. xvi. 13; Isa. xi. 2 ff.

[5] Isa. xi. 2. [6] Ps. li. 10 f. [7] Ezek. xxxvi. 27; Ps. cxliii. 10.

[8] Ex. xxviii. 3; xxxi. 3 ff.; xxxv. 31 ff.

by the spirit of God. Throughout the Old Testament the spirit appears as essentially a divine power communicating to man all the superior abilities that he may possess.[1]

The most characteristic feature of the activity of the divine spirit in the world is unquestionably that by virtue of which it is represented as the agent of evil. In early Hebraism there is no reference, as there is in the Jewish and the Christian church, on the one hand, to good spirits, whose activity is always beneficent, and, on the other, to evil spirits, whose influence is always harmful. The same spirit of God is believed to act sometimes in the one way and sometimes in the other. Hebraism is thus as far removed from dualism as from pantheism.

Thus, in order to explain the discord that broke out between Abimelech and the inhabitants of Shechem, it is said, Jud. ix. 23, that God sent an evil spirit among them. The melancholy that takes possession of Saul is referred to the influence of an evil spirit coming from Jehovah, or of an evil spirit from God.[2] This is the Hebrew standpoint with respect to evil spirits; they appear, not as personal beings independent of God, least of all as beings hostile to God, but as simple emanations or effects of the activity of God in the world.

[1] Knobel, *Der Prophetismus der Hebräer*, I. § 10; [Schultz, II. pp. 202 ff.].

[2] 1 Sam. xvi. 14–16, 23; xviii. 10; xix. 9.

## § 13. THE NATURE OF MAN.

After having become acquainted with Jehovah, the God of Israel, the God of the covenant, we shall next consider man, with whom the covenant was made. We shall first of all discuss what, in modern times, has been called *biblical psychology*. We shall see how little this pretentious term befits the simple conceptions of the Hebrews concerning the human soul.

The older account of creation tells us: "God formed man from the dust of the earth and breathed into his nostrils a breath of life, and man became a living soul."[1] This way of looking at the matter appears elsewhere also in the Old Testament. The book of Job declares that man was formed from clay,[2] and that it is the breath of the Almighty that gives him life.[3] It calls respiration the breath of God in the nostrils of man.[4] It says that if God recalled his spirit and his breath, man would return to the dust.[5] We read exactly the same thing respecting animals, Ps. civ. 29. Ecclesiastes teaches that, when man dies, the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit, the vital breath of man, returns to God who gave it.[6] Thus the body of man, being taken from the earth, is purely material, but it is animated by a vital breath that comes from God.

The body of man is often called flesh,[7] and this same term is applied to animals,[8] which are taken from the

[1] Gen. ii. 7. [2] xxxiii. 6. [3] xxxiii. 4.
[4] xxvii. 3. [5] xxxiv. 14 f. [6] xii. 9.
[7] Gen. ii. 23 f.; vi. 3; xxix. 14; xxxvii. 27; Lev. xiii. 2 ff.; Jud. ix. 2; 2 Sam. v. 1; xix. 13.
[8] Gen. vi. 19; vii. 15 f.; viii. 17; Lev. xvii. 14; Num. xviii. 15.

earth like man.[1] The expression "all flesh" often denotes both men and animals, all living beings.[2] Man as a whole is sometimes called flesh or dust, when the object is to emphasize his weakness, his nothingness, especially in contrast with God.[3]

Man, vivified by the creative breath of God, is called *nephesh chayyah*, living soul.[4] But animals also are thus designated.[5] This is natural, since the term *nephesh*, whose root means *breathe*, often denotes only the principle of life, as numerous passages testify. However, in just as many passages the same term serves to designate the spiritual part of man, the seat of all the affections, and the organ of all the functions of the soul.

Hence we must conclude that the vital principle and spiritual part of man, to the thought of the Hebrews, were one, that they did not distinguish the principle of life from the principle that thinks, feels, and wills. According to the Old Testament, the seat of the soul is in the blood.[6] This is another proof that the Hebrews identified the principle of corporeal with that of spiritual life. The idea that the seat of the soul is in the blood, moreover, is easily explained. Since the soul is the principle of life, and life ceases after a great loss of blood, nothing was more natural for the untaught observer than to conclude that the soul resided in the blood.

[1] Gen. ii. 19; comp. i. 24.

[2] Gen. vi. 12 f., 17; ix. 11, 16 f.; Num. xvi. 22; xviii. 15; xxvii. 16; Jer. xxxii. 27.

[3] Gen. xviii. 27; Isa. xxxi. 3; xl. 6 f.; Jer. xvii. 5; 2 Chron. xxxii. 8; Ps. lvi. 4; lxxviii. 39; ciii. 14.

[4] Gen. ii. 7.

[5] Gen. ii. 19; i. 20 f., 24, 30; ix. 10, 12, 16.

[6] Gen. ix. 4 f.; Lev. xvii. 11, 14; Deut. xii. 23.

Besides a *nephesh*, the Old Testament represents man as possessed of a *ruach*, spirit. The root of this word also means *breathe* and *blow*. Thus it is used to denote the wind and the breath. Moreover, it denotes the principle of life in men and animals.[1] Nothing, again, is more natural than this way of thinking and speaking, since respiration, the breath, is the visible sign of life, and the two cease together. The *ruach*, like the *nephesh*, is besides, as appears from numerous passages, the origin of all the affections, and all the functions of the human soul, the spiritual part of man.

There is then a close resemblance between the *nephesh* and the *ruach*. It even seems as if they are only two different names to designate one and the same thing. Thus, to cite only a few examples, Job xii. 10 affirms that Jehovah holds in his hand the soul of everything that lives, the spirit of all human flesh. A prophet cries to God: "My soul desireth thee in the night, my spirit within me seeketh thee."[2] To denote impatience, the expression used is either the *nephesh* is shortened,[3] or the *ruach* is shortened.[4] When life departs, the expression employed is either the spirit departs,[5] or the soul departs.[6] Likewise, when life returns to a person, it is said the spirit has returned to him,[7] or the soul has returned to him.[8] Sorrow affects both the spirit and the soul.[9] Bitterness is predicated of the spirit,[10]

[1] Gen. vi. 17; xlv. 27; Jud. xv. 19; 1 Sam. xxx. 12; Job xii. 10; Eccl. iii. 19, 21; viii. 8; Isa. lvii. 16; Ezek. x. 17; xxxvii. 8; Hab. ii. 19.

[2] Isa. xxvi. 9.

[3] Num. xxi. 4. [4] Job xxi. 4; Ex. vi. 9. [5] Ps. lxxvii. 3; cxlvi. 4.

[6] Gen. xxxv. 18; 1 Kings xix. 4; Jon. iv. 3; Ps. cvii. 5.

[7] Jud. xv. 19; 1 Sam. xxx. 12. [8] 1 Kings xvii. 21 f.

[9] Job vii. 11. [10] Gen. xxvi. 35.

and of the soul,[1] and so forth. If we cared to take the pains to carry this parallelism farther, we should see that the spirit appears as the organ and seat of all the spiritual faculties of man, and that it is precisely so with the soul.

A third term, but one that is much less frequently employed than the two preceding, has their principal significations. It is *neshamah*, whose root means *blow*, and which denotes both the breath and the principle of life.[2] It is applied in this sense to men and animals.[3] But it denotes also the intellectual principle that comes to man from God, and it is employed as a synonym of *ruach*.[4]

We come finally to *lebh* and *lebhabh*, that is to say, the heart. The heart seems in some passages to be regarded as the seat or centre of corporeal life. In taking food one strengthens one's heart.[5] 1 Sam. xxv. 37 also says that the heart of Nabal died and became like a stone, which probably means that Nabal was smitten with apoplexy (Reuss). These are, however, isolated passages, exceptions to the rule illustrated by numerous examples that the soul and the spirit appear as the principle of corporeal life. It is worthy of special attention that while the *nephesh* and the *ruach* are both attributed to animals, this is not the case with *lebh;* a sufficient proof that there is a real difference between the first two and the last. As organs of spiritual life, however, they greatly resemble one another.

[1] 1 Sam. i. 10; Job xxvii. 2.

[2] Gen. ii. 7; Deut. xx. 16; Josh. x. 40; xi. 11, 14; 1 Kings xvii. 11; Job xxvii. 3; Isa. ii. 22; lvii. 16. [3] Gen. vii. 22; comp. Ps. cl. 6.

[4] Job xxxii. 8; xxxiii. 4; xxxiv. 14; Prov. xx. 27; Isa. xlii. 5.

[5] Gen. xviii. 5; Jud. xix. 5, 8; Ps. civ. 15; comp. 1 Kings xxi. 7.

We will first consider some passages in which soul and heart are employed as synonyms. Thus the remembrance of the benefits of God is to be preserved both in the soul and in the heart.[1] The words of Jehovah are to be laid up in the soul and in the heart;[2] God must be sought with all the heart and with all the soul;[3] one must turn to him with all one's heart and all one's soul,[4] love him, serve him, obey him, fulfil his commands with all one's heart and all one's soul;[5] finally, his faithfulness deserves the gratitude of the whole heart and the whole soul.[6] Sorrows and anxieties alike find room in the soul and in the heart.[7] The soul is puffed up as well as the heart.[8]

There are some special features in which the heart resembles the spirit. The spirit and the heart may both err.[9] Lack of courage is a fault not only of the heart, but also of the spirit.[10] Contention and humility affect both the heart and the spirit;[11] it is the same with sadness, dejection, internal agitation,[12] as well as fear.[13]

Man should renew his heart and his spirit.[14] God can and will give him a new heart and a new spirit.[15] Reflection takes place in the heart, but the spirit also meditates.[16]

[1] Deut. iv. 9. [2] Deut. xi. 18. [3] Deut. iv. 29. [4] Deut. xxx. 10.
[5] Deut. vi. 5; x. 12; xi. 13; xiii. 3; xxvi. 16; xxx. 2; Josh. xxii. 5.
[6] Josh. xxiii. 14. [7] Ps. xiii. 2.
[8] Comp. Prov. xxviii. 25 with xxi. 4, and Ps. ci. 5.
[9] Isa. xxix. 24; Ps. xcv. 10. [10] Josh. ii. 11; v. 1.
[11] Ps. xxxiv. 18; li. 17; Isa. lvii. 15.
[12] Isa. lxv. 14; Ps. cxliii. 4; Prov. xv. 3. [13] Ezek. xxi. 7.
[14] Ezek. xviii. 31. [15] Ezek. xxxvi. 26; xi. 19; Ps. li. 10.
[16] Ps. lxxvii. 6.

It must have been noticed that we have brought forward almost exclusively passages in which the heart is mentioned as synonymous with, or as playing the same part as, the soul or the spirit. This parallelism might be carried farther if we cared to take into account all the passages in which there is a reference to either of the three alone. Any one who undertook this task would find that all the affections and all the functions of our spiritual being are referred in turn to all of them. Each appears as the organ and the seat of all the faculties of the soul, feeling, will, intelligence, as well as of moral and religious life. There is, therefore, no essential difference among them, and it is an error to suppose, with Beck[1] and Delitzsch,[2] that the Old Testament attaches to each of these three terms a peculiar signification, that it contains a psychological system with a perfectly definite terminology. We must, on the contrary, with Harless[3] and Hofmann,[4] acknowledge that the Bible no more contains a scientific psychology than a scientific cosmology. Schultz shares this view. After having shown that in certain passages the expression "my soul" may alternate with "my flesh" or "my bones" when the ego as a sensitive personality is meant,[5] he reaches the conclusion that in this regard the Old Testament freely employs the popular words of expression; that all that can confidently be asserted is that the Scriptures distinguish between the corporeal substratum and the life that reveals itself therein; that this life is called spirit, when the object

[1] *Umriss der bibl. Seelenlehre.* [2] *System of Biblical Psychology.*
[3] *Christl. Ethik*, 5 ed. p. xiii. [4] *Theologie*, I. pp. 284 f.
[5] Ps. vi. 2 f.; xvi. 9; xxxii. 3; xxxv. 10; lxiii. 1; lxxxiv. 2.

is to emphasize its relations with God, and soul or heart when the stress is on personal life; that in elevated discourse these terms are often used one for another, or in the same connection as complements of one another.[1] We must certainly admit that on this subject, as on so many others, the authors of the Old Testament used popular language and not that of the schools; that they spoke of the human soul, spirit, and heart as we ourselves often speak of them, *i.e.* including under each of these terms our entire spiritual being, with all its faculties.

There exist, however, some distinctions among these terms. Thus *nephesh* is sometimes synonymous with person, individual, like the word *soul* in French and German.[2] In the latter sense it may even denote dead persons.[3] It may also take the place of the personal pronoun; in which case my soul, thy soul, his soul, means myself, thyself, himself, or one's self.[4] Neither spirit nor heart is used in this sense. It is therefore soul that seems to denote more particularly man's personality, his ego. Man is a soul, he is not a spirit or a heart; he has a spirit and a heart.[5] The soul is the nobler part, the glory of man.[6]

On the other hand, it is the heart that is almost exclusively the organ of thought, intelligence, knowledge.

[1] II. pp. 249 ff.

[2] Gen. xii. 5; xvii. 14; xlvi. 15, 18, 22, 25–27; Ex. i. 5; xii. 19; xvi. 16; Lev. ii. 1; iv. 2, 27; etc.

[3] Lev. xix. 28; xxi. 1, 11; xxii. 4; Num. v. 2; vi. 6, 11; ix. 6 f., 10.

[4] Gen. xxvii. 4, 19, 25; Jud. xvi. 30; 1 Sam. xviii. 3; xx. 17.

[5] Comp. Oehler, § 70.

[6] Gen. xlix. 6; Ps. vii. 5; xvi. 9; lvii. 8; cviii. 1.

There are only a few passages in which the soul and the spirit perform the functions of intelligence.[1] The heart is, moreover, the moral and religious faculty *par excellence*. It is represented as the organ of moral consciousness[2] and as the source of life in the sense of happiness and salvation.[3] But it also appears as the chief source of sin.[4] It must needs be circumcised[5] because it is uncircumcised.[6] The law of God must be graven on it.[7] It is that of which God takes most account in judging of man's true character.[8] God sounds it and he alone knows it.[9]

Often also the reins are placed in parallelism with the heart, denoting the most private, secret recess of man's spiritual nature.[10] The various terms that denote the bowels are found used in almost the same sense, but with the added idea of compassion.[11] On the other hand, the head and the brain, which play so important a part as the seat of thought among moderns, are not mentioned in this sense in the early literature of Israel. It is the late book of Daniel that speaks of "visions of the head,"[12] while Jeremiah, conforming to the lan-

[1] Josh. xxiii. 14; Ps. cxxxix. 14; Prov. xix. 2; 1 Chron. xxviii. 12; Job xxxii. 8. [2] Job xxvii. 6. [3] Prov. iv. 23; comp. xxiii. 26.

[4] Gen. vi. 5; viii. 21; Jer. iii. 17; v. 23; xvi. 12; Ezek. xi. 21; Eccl. viii. 11; ix. 3; Ps. v. 9; xcv. 10; ci. 4; etc.

[5] Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6. [6] Lev. xxvi. 41; Ezek. xliv. 9.

[7] Deut. vi. 6; Jer. xxxi. 33. [8] 1 Sam. xvi. 7.

[9] 1 Kings viii. 39; Prov. xvii. 3; Ps. xvii. 3.

[10] Jer. xi. 20; xvii. 10; xx. 12; Ps. vii. 9; xvi. 7; xxvi. 2; lxxiii. 21; Prov. xxiii. 15 f.; Job xix. 27.

[11] Gen. xliii. 30; 1 Kings iii. 26; Amos i. 11; Isa. xvi. 11; xlvii. 6; Lam. i. 20; Job xxx. 27; Prov. xii. 10; xx. 27; Ps. xxxix. 3; xl. 8; lxiv. 6; ciii. 1; cix. 22.

[12] ii. 28; iv. 5, 10, 13; vii. 1, 15.

guage of the early Hebrews, says: "The visions of the heart."[1]

It has been supposed that the idea of the pre-existence of the soul is discoverable in certain passages of the Old Testament;[2] this is not the case.[3] It is found only in an apocryphal book.[4] The older account of creation teaches the contrary; according to it man's body was first formed and the soul was afterward imparted to it.[5] And, according to document C, God created man in his own image,[6] *i.e.* body and soul at the same time, and established the law of reproduction for man as well as for animals.[7] Adam is thus enabled to beget a son in his own image,[8] body and soul.

## § 14. THE DIGNITY OF MAN.

The accounts of creation themselves emphasize the exceptional dignity of man. In the older of these accounts we see God giving especial care to the creation of human beings.[9] The way in which he breathes the breath of life into the nostrils of Adam seems to establish a peculiar relation between his life and that of man. We have seen above that the Old Testament sometimes puts men and animals into the same category, applying to them indiscriminately the designation "all flesh," and attributing to both the *nephesh* and the *ruach;* this account, on the contrary, establishes an

[1] xxiii. 16. [2] 1 Sam. ii. 6; Job i. 21; Ps. cxxxix. 15.
[3] De Wette, § 115, *Archeologie;* von Cölln, *Theologie*, § 40; Oehler, § 70; Schultz, II. pp. 250 ff. [4] Wis. viii. 19 f.
[5] Gen. ii. 7. [6] Gen. i. 26 f. [7] Gen. i. 22, 28.
[8] Gen. v. 3. [9] Gen. ii. 7, 21 f.

essential distinction between them, exalting man far above the animals and all other created things. God, after the creation of man, planted the garden of Eden, that he might till and tend it.[1] It is man also for whom the animals were created, and they were brought to him that he might give them names.[2] In the chapters that immediately follow, the animal and the vegetable kingdom are both made subject to man.[3] But among the animals, man finds no helpmeet for him.[4] Then God creates woman, taking her from man, in order that she may be a help like him.[5]

Man and woman, then, occupy an exceptional and peculiarly exalted position in the work of creation; all else is only for them, for their use. However, in conformity to the universal sentiment of antiquity, the position of man is even more exalted than that of woman. Woman was created only for the sake of man, to be a help to him,[6] and she is taken from him. All this indicates a kind of inferiority, a kind of dependence of woman over against man. The distance that separates the one from the other, however, should not be exaggerated. In *v.* 24 of our narrative, we see that man must place above all other ties those that unite him to his wife, and that after their union they form one flesh. At the same time, therefore, with the supremacy of man and the subordination of woman, their equality in certain respects is also recognized.

The account of creation in document C,[7] dating from a time when Israelitish thought was further developed, presents the same ideas, but in a new form and with a

[1] Gen. ii. 8–15. [2] Gen. ii. 19 f. [3] Gen. iii. 21; iv. 3 f.
[4] Gen. ii. 20. [5] Gen. ii. 21–23. [6] Gen. ii. 18, 20. [7] Gen. i.

more philosophic cast. Here the first human pair is not created until after all the rest. This, no doubt, is meant to indicate that, to the thought of the author, man is the end and crown of the work of creation, that he is its lord and master, and that he should not appear upon the scene until all else is ready and can be placed at his service. As soon as man is created he is called to rule over all other terrestrial creatures; the plants also, it is said, are to serve him for food.[1] The expression in *v.* 26, "And God said: Let us make man," indicates a special determination, and as it were a solemn act on the part of God. This creative act is therefore not like the others introduced by the simple expression: "God said." Verses 26 f. declare, besides, that God created man in his own image and after his own likeness. It is clear that this account emphasizes and specifies the peculiar dignity of man and his superiority over the rest of creation. Here, however, there is no trace of inequality between woman and man. They are both formed by the same creative act; they are both like God. Besides this difference between documents A and C, it should be noted that, according to the former, man did not originally resemble God, and was not intended to be like him; on the contrary, he became guilty and brought upon himself the ills of life by wishing to become like God, and like him to know how to distinguish between good and evil.[2] The older document does not, therefore, attribute to man so exalted a dignity as the other.

In precisely what consists the image of God in man? Theology has read many things into this expression.

[1] Gen. i. 28 f.

[2] See Gen. iii. and § 19.

In the first place it has distinguished between the image of God and his likeness. This is a serious error. Though in *v.* 26 there is reference to the image and the likeness of God, in *v.* 27 it is only the former to which reference is made, which seems to indicate that the two terms are synonymous. The use of both in *v.* 26 is probably only an illustration of the law of parallelism, which plays an important part in the elevated style of Hebrew literature. According to Oehler the second term serves only to reinforce the first;[1] others find this sole difference between the two, that the first is concrete and the second abstract.[2]

In early Protestant theology the image of God in man was the state of moral perfection that was lost by the fall. This is incorrect; the document that mentions the fall does not speak of this image, and *vice versa.* According to document C, which alone speaks of it, this image is preserved despite the corruption that causes the deluge.[3] If we allow ourselves to be guided by the context, we see that the resemblance of man to God consists chiefly in dominion over all things, and especially over the animals. For it is said: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, *and let him rule* over the fish of the sea, over the birds of heaven, over the beasts, over all the earth, and over all the reptiles that crawl on the earth." Ps. viii. also makes this superiority of man, that allies him to divinity, consist in dominion over all the works of God, and especially over the animals.[4] Hävernick,[5] Oehler,[6] and

[1] § 68. [2] Schultz, II. pp. 257 f.; Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, I. p. 287. [3] Gen. ix. 6; comp. v. 3.
[4] *vv.* 6–9. [5] *Theologie*, p. 96. [6] § 68.

Schultz,[1] however, combat the idea that the resemblance of man to God consists in such dominion, because, they say, it is only the consequence of the superiority of man, and not this superiority itself. This distinction is very just; but was it made by the author of document C, or by that of Ps. viii.? Nothing indicates that this is the case or renders such a supposition tenable. We have seen, on the contrary, that the early Israelites were little inclined to subtle distinctions.

It is easy to understand why, in Israel, the superiority of man and his resemblance to God were made to consist, above all, in ruling ability. Be it remembered that of all the attributes of God, that which the Old Testament extols most persistently is his controlling might. It is, therefore, at once simple and natural that, in speaking of the resemblance of man to God, it should be made to consist in the divine perfection *par excellence*, the feature of divinity from the Israelitish standpoint most characteristic of it; in other words, that there should be attributed to man as the mark of his superiority the ability to rule like God, the supreme ruler. But though the most salient attribute of God was taken as a point of comparison, this does not mean that the divine perfections in general did not find subordinate consideration. This also, from the standpoint of the Old Testament, is very natural. We have seen that the Israelites pictured to themselves God in the human form. Hence they would necessarily think that, in creating man, God exactly copied himself, that he created him exactly in his own image. And since they

[1] II. p. 257.

certainly gave God a body, and did not regard him as a pure spirit, they probably thought that man resembled God, and God man, both corporeally and spiritually.[1]

It is therefore a false interpretation of Gen. i. 26, that claims to find in it the assertion of the moral perfection of man. What ought to have made this clear is the fact that after the fall and the corruption of morals that appears at the time of the deluge, document C continues to predicate of man resemblance to God.[2] Gen. i. 31, it is true, implies the thought that man was created good; but he is simply regarded as good in the same sense as the other creatures; *i.e.* inasmuch as, by the creative act, he has received the corporeal and spiritual qualities necessary for the realization of the idea of man.[3] There is no reference in this passage to moral perfection.

What we have just said does not amount to a denial that the moral supremacy of man is taught in the Old Testament. It only shows that the classic passages quoted in favor of the doctrine of the moral perfection of man leave his moral nature entirely in the background. But having once established this, we abide by the assertion that the Old Testament insists on our moral dignity. Only, instead of seeking the proof of this assertion in an expression that in reality does not contain it, and that occurs only twice in a single document in the entire literature of the Hebrews, we be-

[1] Comp. Schoeberlein, Schaff-Herzog's *Cyclopedia*, art. *Image of God;* Reuss, *Hist. Sainte*, I. p. 282.

[2] Gen. v. 3; ix. 6.

[3] Schultz, II. p. 262; Müller, *Christian Doctrine of Sin*, II. pp. 349 f.

lieve that we find it taught in this literature as a whole. Not that it is often explicitly asserted; it is rather everywhere taken for granted. What is implied by the fundamental idea of the religion of Israel, the covenant of God with man? What is presupposed by the legal *régime*, which gives man the choice between good and evil, blessing and cursing, life and death? Doubtless it is something different from that which traditional theology claims to find in the Hebrew canon touching the moral dignity of man, a state of original but temporary perfection which was soon totally forfeited. But the principal fault of this theology is that it has found in the Bible precisely what it does not contain and has not been able to discover what is clearly taught therein. We must, however, devote a special chapter to the further discussion of the great subject of the fall, to which we have here alluded.

## § 15. FAITHFULNESS TO JEHOVAH.

Having learned to know God and man according to the conceptions current in Israel, we must now see what God requires of man.

Jehovah is a God whose nature it is to be faithful to his people; but he requires in return that his people shall also be faithful to him. Faithfulness to Jehovah is the cardinal virtue in Israel. This appears everywhere in the Old Testament, in the historical, the prophetical, the legal, and the didactic portions. Everywhere and in all the forms of language, the sacred writers teach Israel that they are to serve their God, that they are to serve him alone, and serve him in all

faithfulness. But how was this faithfulness conceived? upon what sentiments was it to rest? and in what way was it to be translated into life?

The essential mark of faithfulness and the moral life in Israel is obedience to God. The old covenant is the *régime* of law; God commands and man is to obey; he is to obey God even in the least details of life, since the legislation of each of the documents of the Pentateuch undertakes the regulation of these details. The people Israel, as regards Jehovah, occupy the position of a subject toward his master, a son toward his father, a wife toward her husband, a servant toward his master or lord;[1] now each of these positions implies chiefly obedience toward God. The Old Testament knows no morality but religious morality, according to which the virtue of any act consists in the fulfilment of the will of God. In Israel the moral life and the religious life are indissolubly united.

The faithful fulfilment of the commands of God is generally designated in the Old Testament by the term righteousness,[2] which we might render normalcy of conduct. The faithful Israelite is everywhere represented as a righteous person. Since Israelitish piety was in a way identified with the observance of the commands of God, or righteousness, this last term is often synonymous with piety. In the Psalms especially the righteous are frequently contrasted with the wicked; they are the pious men in Israel.

Israelitish virtue, righteousness, piety, since they consisted essentially in the observance of the commands of God, were very external; first, because the law was

[1] See § 4. [2] Deut. vi. 25; Ezek. xviii. 5–9; etc.

always composed largely of ritualistic regulations, which indeed, in document C, completely predominate, and, secondly, because this law was imposed from without. Righteousness and morality in Israel are in great measure simply legality. Moreover, the principal motive to righteousness and faithfulness is external and selfish; *viz.* promises of earthly blessings in case of faithfulness, and threats of earthly penalties in case of unfaithfulness, as we shall see later.

Internal tendencies, however, the sentiments of the heart, which shall result in faithfulness, are not lost sight of. Deuteronomy, for example, requires that the law of God be taken to heart, and that it remain in the heart;[1] that God be sought and served with all the heart and all the soul;[2] and above all, that he be feared and loved with all the heart and all the soul.[3] Outside of this book the fear of God is often enjoined as the fundamental principle of piety and the principal motive to faithfulness, to righteousness.[4] This sentiment, which dominates Israelitish piety and virtue, is, in fact, of inferior value. It is found in intimate connection with the idea that Jehovah is first of all a mighty God, just and holy, who will not let evil go unpunished. Hence the numerous threats of punishment, directed against unfaithfulness, in the law and the prophets. But, alongside of this sentiment, we find also in Deuteronomy — not however, it is true, in so many passages —

[1] vi. 6; xi. 18. [2] iv. 29; xxvi. 16; xxviii. 47; xxx. 2, 10.

[3] iv. 10; v. 29; vi. 2, 5, 13, 24; viii. 6; x. 12, 20; xi. 1, 13, 22; xiii. 3 f.; xiv. 23; xvii. 19; xix. 9; xxviii. 58; xxx. 6, 16, 20; xxxi. 12 f.

[4] Gen. xxii. 12; 1 Sam. xii. 24; Job i. 1, 8; ii. 3; Eccl. xii. 15; etc.

the sentiment of love in God. In the Old Testament, in general, there is more frequent reference to the holiness and the righteousness of God than to his love, and the Israelites are more frequently exhorted therein to fear Jehovah than to love him. The idea formed of God and the sentiments felt toward him are indeed closely related to one another. In some passages besides these in Deuteronomy, and even in one place in document A, love to God is expressly represented as a fundamental sentiment of piety.[1] This sentiment doubtless existed in Israel more generally than at first appears, and it was the same with gratitude toward God. The Israelites always referred to God the blessings that they enjoyed, and expressed to him their gratitude for them. This appears even in the song of Deborah, Jud. v., and in that which celebrates the deliverance from Egyptian slavery, Ex. xv. We see it later in the numerous psalms of thanksgiving that date from all periods of the history of Israel. A people that always celebrated thus the blessings of God and sang his praises experienced a high degree of gratitude toward God and love for him. It is the sentiment of gratitude to which document A so early appeals to induce Israel faithfully to observe the covenant and the law of God.[2] But Deuteronomy most of all seeks to awaken this sentiment, a sentiment which shall result in faithfulness toward God, through the remembrance of his blessings,[3] and his love,[4] the source of his bless-

[1] Ex. xx. 6; Isa. lvi. 6; lviii. 14; Dan. ix. 5; Ps. xviii. 1; xxxi. 23; xxxvii. 4; xcvii. 10; cxlv. 20. [2] Ex. xix. 4 ff.; xx. 2 ff.

[3] i. 31; iv. 32 ff.; vi. 20 ff.; viii. 6 ff.; x. 20 ff.; xi. 1 ff.; xxix. 2 ff., 9 ff. [4] iv. 37; vii. 8; x. 15; xxiii. 5.

ings. It is the same with the legal fragment, Lev. xvii.–xxvi. These laws often add to the other motives for faithfulness this, that the commands which are to be fulfilled come from Jehovah.[1] Sometimes the more complete formula is: "I am Jehovah your God."[2] This, without doubt, means that these laws emanate from the true God who can oversee the fulfilment of them, and render to each one according to his works. But the expression "your God" may also imply the idea that Jehovah is the master, the lord, the ruler of Israel, and has the right to command his people and require of them obedience.[3] Finally, it may signify this: I am your benefactor, your protector, and your saviour; you owe me faithful obedience out of gratitude for the blessings that I have granted you, and especially for deliverance from Egyptian slavery, that first and peculiarly remarkable blessing.[4]

If love for God and gratitude to him should produce obedience toward God, love for one's neighbor should result in the faithful fulfilment of one's duties toward that neighbor. Such love is also enjoined in the Old Testament, but more rarely.[5] It may be presupposed in many cases like love to God himself. Yet it is more correct to say that the Hebrew, who emphasizes the absolute sovereignty of God and represents rules of conduct as emanating directly from him, generally leaves in the background secondary motives to faithfulness,

[1] Lev. xviii. 5 f., 21; xix. 12, 14, 16, 28, 30, 32, 37; xx. 8; xxi. 12; xxii. 2 f.; viii. 30 f.; xxvi. 2.

[2] Lev. xviii. 4, 30; xix. 2 f., 10, 25, 31, 34, 36; etc.

[3] Lev. xxv. 55. [4] Lev. xix. 36 f.; xxii. 32 f.; xxv. 38.

[5] Lev. xix. 18, 34; Deut. x. 19; Hos. iv. 1; Mic. vi. 8; Zech. vii. 9; Prov. x. 12; xvi. 6.

and brings to the front only this prime reason, that God has spoken, and man owes him obedience, in all things. From the Israelitish point of view man should fulfil his duties to his neighbor, as all others, because God commands it. It appears from the foregoing that knowledge of God and faith in God are essential elements of piety, of the moral and religious life of Israel. It was, of course, necessary to have a knowledge of the holiness, the righteousness, and the judgments of God, as well as of his love and his blessings, and it was necessary to believe, in order to be moved to fear and love for God, to gratitude to him, and in consequence to the faithful fulfilment of his will. Knowledge of God is often presupposed, but frequently also enjoined in the Old Testament, as an essential qualification of the true Israelite.[1] It is the same with faith in God.[2] Unbelief is strongly censured and severely punished.[3]

## § 16. WORSHIP.

The fact most deserving attention is the strict centralization of worship, which was attained in our period and which is the fundamental doctrine of Deuteronomy.

We have seen that, in ancient times, the Israelites could rear altars and offer sacrifices in any place, that

[1] Hos. iv. 1, 6; v. 4; vi. 3, 6; Isa. xi. 9; xix. 21; lii. 6; Jer. ix. 24; xxii. 16; xxiv. 7; xxxi. 34; etc.

[2] Gen. xv. 6; Hos. ii. 7; Mic. vii. 7; Neh. i. 7; Zeph. iii. 12; Jer. xiv. 22; xvii. 7; xxxix. 18; Isa. vii. 9; viii. 17; x. 20; xii. 2; xxv. 9; xxvi. 3 f., 8; xxviii. 16; xxx. 15, 18; xl. 31; xliii. 10; etc.

[3] Num. xx. 7–12; Isa. xxx. 1 ff.; xxxi. 1 ff.; Jer. ii. 17–19, 36 f.; xvii. 5 f.; Deut. i. 32 ff.; ix. 23; 2 Kings vii. 14; Ps. lxxxix. 18–21, 31.

a multiplicity of places of worship was perfectly admissible, but that, nevertheless, the ark of the covenant was already a rallying-point and a means of religious centralization for all Israel. What afterward contributed to such centralization was the erection of the temple at Jerusalem. It is easy to understand that this royal and central temple, with its stately worship, would, little by little, eclipse all the other sanctuaries. The worship of the high-places, however, continued yet a long time, alongside of the worship at Jerusalem. Other circumstances were necessary to produce in this respect a radical reform. The event that unquestionably exercised the greatest influence in this direction was the overthrow of the kingdom of the ten tribes. From that moment the people Israel found themselves reduced almost to the single tribe of Judah, surrounding Jerusalem and its temple. Moreover, the multiplicity of places of worship had given rise to a multiplicity of gods; the high-places served not only for the worship of Jehovah, they had become seats of idolatry.[1] This fact furnished a stronger reason for opposing the worship of high-places. This is what Hezekiah undertook to do.[2] Nothing indicates, however, that his efforts were crowned with success. It was different after the discovery of Deuteronomy, or the legal part of it, which distinctly identifies the worship of high-places with idolatry and for the first time requires a strict centralization of worship.[3]

[1] Jer. vii. 29 ff.; xvii. 2; xix. 5; Ezek. vi. 3 ff., 13; xx. 28 ff.; Lev. xxvi. 30; 1 Kings xi. 7; xiv. 23; 2 Kings xvii. 9 ff.; xviii. 4; xxi. 3 ff.; xxiii. 5, 13. [2] 2 Kings xviii. 4.

[3] Chap. xii.; xiv. 22 ff.; xv. 20; xvi. 2, 5 ff., 11, 15; xvii. 8 ff.; xviii. 6; xxvi. 2.

This legislation led Josiah to proceed to the reform of worship, an account of which is found 2 Kings xxiii. It is this legislation also under the influence of which the editor of the books of Kings, after having conscientiously recounted how, until the time of Hezekiah, the most faithful kings offered sacrifices on the high-places, feels the need of repeatedly expressing his regret that it had been so.[1] Idolatry, however, once more uplifted its head after Josiah; for we read that his successors did that which was evil in the eyes of Jehovah,[2] which certainly means that they devoted themselves to unlawful worship and to idolatry. Jeremiah and Ezekiel reproach Israel with their idolatry, past and present, more than any of the other prophets. Lev. xvii. also, which was written during or a little after the Exile, reinforces the Deuteronomic legislation respecting the centralization of worship. This chapter forbids under pain of death, not only the offering of sacrifices, but even the slaughtering of animals for ordinary use, elsewhere than at the lawful sanctuary. Though regulations of this sort favored Jewish Levitism beyond measure, they were justified by the circumstances that provoked them; for they were directed against idolatry, which seemed indestructible, and against which it was necessary finally to take serious precautions and direct the most energetic measures.

The death-blow was not, however, given to idolatry and the worship at the high-places until the grand catastrophe of the Exile. Not until after the return from captivity was the absolute centralization of wor-

[1] 1 Kings iii. 2 f.; xv. 14; xxii. 44; 2 Kings xii. 3; xiv. 4; xv. 4, 35; xvi. 4.

[2] 2 Kings xxiii. 32, 37; xxiv. 9, 19.

ship put into practice in a decisive fashion among the Jewish people. The circumstances were then peculiarly favorable. The Jews, returned to their country, were few in number; they were, therefore, able to cluster more closely about Jerusalem and its restored temple. The Exile had, moreover, caused an interruption of at least half a century in traditional usages, and it was represented by the prophets as the consequence and just penalty of long-continued idolatry.

With the necessity of a strict centralization of worship arose that of a centralization of the sacerdotal functions. This was likewise for the first time ordained in Deuteronomy, being itself also inspired by the desire to put an end to idolatry and to the abuses to which the freedom of early times had given occasion.

While formerly every father of a family had the right to fulfil the sacerdotal functions, and those who devoted themselves exclusively to these functions could be taken from it mattered not what tribe, Deuteronomy assigns the priesthood to the tribe of Levi alone; it excludes, therefore, any one who does not belong to this tribe; according to it all the sons of Levi are consecrated to the priesthood, and every priest should belong to the tribe of Levi, or be a Levitical priest.[1] It is evident that Levitical priests are contrasted with priests taken indiscriminately from the mass of the people.[2]

Comparing verse 25 with verse 9 of chapter xxi., we are convinced beyond a peradventure that in this book the term Levite is synonymous with Levitical priest. It is the same with Jer. xxxiii. 18, 21 f. This language

[1] xvii. 9, 18; xviii. 1; xxi. 5; xxiv. 8; xxvii. 9; xxxi. 9.

[2] 1 Kings xii. 31; xiii. 33; 2 Kings xvii. 32.

respecting the Levitical priests continues to be used by the prophets of the Exile[1] and even into Chronicles.[2] In fact, as we shall see farther on, the distinction between the priests and the Levites did not begin to be made until during and after the Exile.

According to Deuteronomy all the Levites are priests; moreover, they are all priests of the same rank. There is to be found in it no more trace of a sacerdotal hierarchy such as that with which we later become acquainted, than in the most ancient documents. Before the Exile, the distinction between priests and Levites being entirely ignored, the term Levite was the honorary title of the priest. In all the ancient literature we find only two passages that indicate a different standpoint; they are 2 Sam. xv. 24 and 1 Kings viii. 4; but a comparison of 2 Chron. v. 5 with the second of these passages clearly proves that these two passages have been modified in accordance with the later standpoint.[3] In fact, the entire sacerdotal hierarchy as it existed before the Exile and after the time of King Joash consisted of a high-priest and subordinate priests with door-keepers to the temple,[4] which last, however, were also priests.[5] From ancient times there were perhaps a head-priest and subordinate employés at each of the various places of worship of any importance. It is probable that the kings, who, after the time of David, had the upper hand in affairs ecclesiastical, for the

[1] Ezek. xliii. 19; xliv. 15; Isa. lxvi. 21.

[2] 2 Chron. v. 5; xxiii. 18; xxx. 27.

[3] Wellhausen, *History*, pp. 43, 141 f.

[4] 2 Kings xii. 10; xxii. 4, 8; xxiii. 4; xxv. 18; comp. Jer. lii. 24; xx. 1; xxix. 26.

[5] 2 Kings xii. 9.

better conduct of the service of God established a kind of sacerdotal hierarchy at Jerusalem. But such an organization does not resemble the sacerdotal hierarchy of document C, to which we shall refer hereafter; it cannot have had any religious value or have been regarded as emanating from God, otherwise the silence observed by Deuteronomy and Ezekiel on the subject of the sovereign pontificate, though they are relatively explicit with reference to the priesthood, could not well be explained. Not until after the Exile, when the king, heretofore the *summus episcopus* in Israel, had disappeared, did the high-priest begin to play a considerable part.[1]

Except in the two respects of which we have just spoken, our period presents nothing worthy of especial attention concerning worship. We must, however, describe the attitude of the prophets with regard to the traditional institutions and ceremonies of their religion. This attitude is not hostile, as has been claimed. The truth is, rather, that the prophets, without despising external worship, ascribed to the religious and moral life the balance of importance. As Oehler very justly observes, "the program of prophetism" is indicated, 1 Sam. xv. 22, in these words: "Obedience is of more value than sacrifices, and observance of the word of Jehovah than the fat of rams." This program is developed in a series of passages[2] in which the prophets place above religious ceremonies, feasts, sacrifices, fasts,

[1] Hag. i. 1, 12; ii. 2, 4; Zech. iii. 1 ff.; vi. 11 ff.

[2] Amos v. 21–24; Hos. iv. 1 ff.; vi. 6; Mic. vi. 6–8; Isa. i. 11–17; lviii. 3 ff.; Jer. vi. 19 f.; vii. 1 ff., 9 ff., 21 ff.; Zech. vii. 4–10; Ps. xl. 6 ff.; l. 7 ff., 16 ff.

etc., the knowledge of God, honesty, righteousness, charity, or amendment in heart and life after unfaithfulness.

Jer. vii. 22 f. is a classic passage as regards the question under discussion. The prophet there declares that Jehovah gave the fathers no command on the subject of burnt offerings and sacrifices, that he simply commanded them to walk in all his ways. In other words, the sacrifices are not of divine institution, only the moral regulations. This agrees with 1 Sam. xv. 22, where obedience and observance of the word of Jehovah are contrasted with sacrifices, which, consequently, are not based on the word, the command, the initiative, of God.[1] The prophets never see in the neglect of any ceremony anything blameworthy; it is only transgression of the moral law and idolatry that they condemn. To rites in themselves they ascribe comparatively little value; for them the important thing is that every act of worship be performed exclusively in honor of Jehovah.

We see, however, in Jeremiah for instance, that though the prophets placed the moral above the ceremonial law, they did not mean to reject or abolish the latter. Jeremiah promises that the sacrifices and the priesthood shall never fail in Israel, even under the reign of the Messiah.[2] The prophets, then, simply oppose the abuse of rites, and not the rites themselves; they try to teach that external rites cannot take the place of sentiments and acts of faithfulness toward God and one's fellows.

[1] Comp. Hos. vi. 6; Isa. i. 11 ff.; xxix. 13; Mic. vi. 6–8.
[2] Jer. xxxiii. 18; xvii. 26.

That prophetism before the Exile, so far from completely rejecting external worship, ascribed to it a degree of value, is, moreover, proven from Deuteronomy, which, though written under its influence, finds plenty of room for all that concerns worship, the place of worship, the priesthood, the religious feasts, Levitical purity, and other subjects of the same nature.

What we have said, therefore, applies more especially to the earlier prophets up to the time of Jeremiah. In the next period we shall see that, beginning with Ezekiel, external worship gained so much in importance that the prophets themselves yielded, in respect to it, to the influence of Levitism, which finally degenerated more and more into formalism and Pharisaism.

## § 17. ISRAEL'S UNFAITHFULNESS AND THE ESSENCE OF SIN.

We come now to the subject of sin. We should, however, proceed in a manner contrary to the spirit of the Old Testament and especially of prophetism, if we began by treating this subject from a purely abstract standpoint. Here, again, the prophets avoided all speculation. They set out from concrete facts; they allowed themselves to be guided by experience; and they had in view only a practical end. Nearly all the prophets begin by reproaching their people with numerous breaches of faithfulness, to which they attach the threat of severe punishments.

We shall not, of course, here give a catalogue of all the sins with which Israel are reproached in the various prophetical and historical books. It is only necessary

to read the book of Judges or the books of Kings, Amos, and Hosea, Isaiah and Micah, or Jeremiah and Ezekiel, to find that it is almost always, in substance, the same transgressions that are noticed. In the historical and the prophetical books, the sin that is oftenest mentioned and that is reckoned most serious is the constantly reviving idolatry by which Israel broke the covenant with Jehovah. Along with this chief sin, transgression of the first of the ten commandments, the prophets very often mention the sins against one's neighbor that are condemned by the second table of the decalogue, — murder, theft, adultery, false testimony. Amos thus early reproaches the Israelites with being wanting in justice and equity, despising rectitude for the sake of presents, leading licentious lives, oppressing the lowly, the needy, devoting themselves in their cupidity to unjust traffic, trusting in their own power; and most of these charges appear in the other prophets. Another form of unfaithfulness with which Israel are often reproached is that of putting their trust in their powerful neighbors and seeking alliance with them instead of trusting in God.

What interests us more than a complete and detailed catalogue of the forms of Israel's unfaithfulness, is the dominant idea of sin, the principle unifying its diverse manifestations. According to the Old Testament, he who sins sins against God.[1] This is what forms the essence of sin, and what gives to the idea of sin its

[1] Gen. xiii. 13; xx. 6; xxxix. 9; Ex. x. 16; xxxii. 33; Lev. v. 19; Num. xv. 30; Deut. i. 41; 1 Sam. vii. 6; xiv. 33; 2 Sam. xii. 13; 2 Chron. xix. 10; xxviii. 10, 13; Ps. li. 4; Jer. xiv. 7, 20; xvi. 10; Isa. xlii. 24; etc.

peculiar depth and gravity. The Israelite saw in sin an offence against God, because he saw in it a transgression of the divine will, which should serve man as a rule of conduct. Man should be familiar with the will of God since God has revealed it to him; Israel in particular know it perfectly through the law and the prophets. The legislation of the Pentateuch takes account of the least details of life, and represents all the laws and ordinances as so many commands of God. In this way all life, national and individual, public and private, civil and religious, was regulated, and very minutely, by God himself. Not to obey these laws was to transgress the will of God, to sin against him. The fall of Adam itself is represented as a transgression of a formal command of God, an act of disobedience toward God. This is the way in which sin is represented everywhere in the Old Testament.

The application that is here made of this way of thinking may perhaps be found far from perfect. It is none the less true, however, that this will always be the fundamental principle of all healthy piety, of all truly religious morality. The Israelites may have fallen into all sorts of errors concerning sin; they may have regarded as sins what we do not consider such; they may have had scruples about matters that seem to us perfectly indifferent, like the distinction between clean and unclean foods; they may not have regarded as sins what we consider such, *e.g.* the complete extermination of hostile peoples; but it will never be possible from the religious standpoint to form a better conception than they did of the essence of sin.

Since the law, the expression of the will of God, reg-

ulated in the main only external acts, sin was conceived of in a way somewhat superficial and external. It must, however, be admitted that it was not made to consist solely in external transgressions, but also in internal dispositions. The decalogue itself forbids evil desires along with evil acts and words.[1] That they went to the very source of sin, to the internal dispositions, is also proven by the fact that they insist, as we shall see later on, upon the necessity of the regeneration of the heart as a preparation for doing the will of God. Schultz, however, remarks that from ancient times there did not exist ideas so sound and correct; that sin was first conceived of in a more superficial manner, as simple disregard of the religious and civil practices of Israel; and that prophetism alone rose to a higher standpoint.[2] This is perfectly correct and altogether natural. The child has only a superficial idea of sin. It is the same with peoples in the stage of infancy. Now Israel passed through infancy before reaching manhood. When we compare the legislation of Deuteronomy with that of document A, we notice a very perceptible progress in this regard, for the latter insists much less on internal dispositions than the former. So also it is the prophets Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and deutero-Isaiah, who, more than the earlier prophets, proclaim the necessity of the regeneration of the heart. The book of Judges and those of Samuel bear witness to very rude morals; they describe acts of barbarity which do not, however, seem to have been regarded as blameworthy. Prophets like Samuel and Elijah cause to be executed, or themselves execute,

[1] Ex. xx. 17. [2] II. 281 f.

horrible massacres. It is evident that, under ancient prophetism, moral ideas, notions of good and evil, were still very imperfect, and that therefore the idea of sin was more superficial than it finally became.

## § 18. THE EXTENT OF SIN.

A series of passages assert that sin is universal, that it extends to all men.[1] Some teach that man is a sinner from his youth or from his birth.[2] How, in fact, could anything clean be born of an unclean person?[3]

History, as it is recounted in the Old Testament, also tends to establish the universality of sin. It shows that man sinned, and that immediately after his creation; that his descendants sinned to such a degree as to bring the deluge upon the whole human race; that after this chastisement men began to sin again, as is proven by the erection of the Tower of Babel and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. The patriarchs were not free from faults. And the entire history of the people Israel is largely but a recital of their repeated lapses from faithfulness, from the desert to the Exile. As for the heathen peoples, they are generally represented as enemies of God.

Nevertheless, certain passages might lead one to believe that the Old Testament admits exceptions to the general rule. Alongside of wicked Cain we find pious Abel.[4] Farther on reference is made to Enoch, who

[1] 1 Kings viii. 46; Job iv. 17–19; xiv. 4; xv. 14–16; Ps. xiv. 1–3; liii. 1–3; cxvi. 11; cxliii. 2; Prov. xx. 9; Eccl. vii. 20.

[2] Gen. viii. 21; Ps. li. 5; lviii. 3; comp. Isa. xlviii. 8.

[3] Job xiv. 4; xv. 14.

[4] Gen. iv.

walked with God.[1] Noah also, in spite of the general corruption, remained righteous.[2] The biblical narratives accuse Abraham and Joseph of no faults; for what might seem to us blameworthy or immoral was probably not so in the eyes of the sacred authors. Abraham furnishes a striking contrast to the perversity of Sodom and Gomorrah, and Joseph to the wickedness of his brothers. Job is called an upright, righteous man, fearing God and shunning evil.[3] There are psalmists who call themselves righteous, innocent, pure.[4] Many passages, especially in the Psalms, mention numerous righteous persons.

Does the Old Testament really admit exceptions to the universality of sin? This is not impossible, since the natural corruption of man is not so strongly emphasized in it as in the New Testament, and since, on the other hand, human freedom is clearly recognized. Why might not certain men have made a good use of their freedom and have been preserved from evil? Once more, it is admissible from the standpoint of the Old Testament; for all the books do not assert, as some passages do, that there is no one who is righteous, not even one. Nothing, however, on the other hand, indicates that the righteousness attributed to some men is perfect. It is possible that in all these cases the sacred authors meant to speak only of a relative righteousness. David, for example, is often represented as the righteous man *par excellence*, for love of whom God many times blessed or preserved from deserved penalties his unworthy successors, the model theocratic king

[1] Gen. v. 22. [2] Gen. vi. 9; vii. 1. [3] Job i. 1, 8; ii. 3.
[4] Ps. vii. 8; xviii. 20 ff.; comp. Job. xxii. 30.

who is the type of the Messiah, — and in spite of this the Old Testament places to his account crimes that it represents as such. Moses also, be it remembered, who is, nevertheless, exalted above all the other prophets,[1] committed, according to the biblical narratives, faults so grave that he was not permitted to enter the land of Canaan. Isaiah, who surely reckoned himself among the righteous, declares that he has unclean lips.[2] Document C ordains that all Israel, the priest and the high-priest included, must needs be purified once a year.[3] Finally, that the Old Testament attributes to certain men righteousness and uprightness, apparently in an absolute, but really in a relative sense, is shown by the fact that these qualities are, as we have seen, actually attributed to Job in the former sense, and that the same book then categorically asserts that there is not a single man who is perfectly clean,[4] and that Job himself is not.[5] The author of Ps. xxxii. unquestionably ranks himself among the righteous men of whom he speaks, *v.* 11, and yet in the last verses he confesses his sins. The same thing is found elsewhere.[6]

It may be well to recall here what we have already observed, *viz.* that in the Old Testament righteousness is very often synonymous with piety. The righteous, therefore, as contrasted with the unfaithful and impious, are the faithful in the entirely relative sense that we give to this term, when we use it to designate sincere and active Christians, in contrast with doubtful Christians or irreligious people.

[1] Num. xii. 6–8; Deut. xxxiv. 10–12. [2] Isa. vi. 5.
[3] Lev. xvi. [4] Job xiv. 4; xv. 14–16.
[5] Job xiii. 26; x. 14; vii. 21. [6] Ps. xl. 7–12; comp. xli. 4 with *v.* 12.

## § 19. THE ORIGIN OF SIN.

Whence comes it that all men are sinners? Are they so naturally, by virtue of their constitution, or as the result of a change in their original nature? This question deserves our attention the more because Jewish and Christian theology have claimed to find the doctrine of the Fall in the Old Testament.

Let us begin with the consideration of Gen. ii. and iii., where the explanation of the origin of sin has generally been sought. Of the entire canonical literature of Israel these two chapters alone tell us of a primitive state of man preceding the entrance of sin into the world. It is, therefore, fair to conclude that the Israelites did not give great attention to this question. Hope for the future, not regret for the past, is the dominant note of the religion of Israel. What a difference between the idea of the Fall and the Messianic hope! The latter plays a leading part in the literature of the Old Testament ; the former is mentioned therein but once. We must, however, examine this story more closely, both on account of the importance that has been attributed to it and on account of the false interpretations that have been given to it. But let us as far as possible lay aside these interpretations and all dogmatic contrivances, that we may grasp the content of the story in all its purity.

We remark first of all that our story does not confine itself to a description of the primitive condition of the first human pair. After having referred to the creation of woman and the institution of marriage,[1] the author

[1] Gen. ii. 22 ff.

proceeds immediately to the account of the Fall.[1] We shall imitate his example, not dwelling on the original condition of man, about which we are not able to say much, but regarding it chiefly in its relation to the Fall.

When we enter into the details, we are struck with the analogy that exists, on the one hand, between the innocent condition of the first man and childhood, on the other, between his sinful condition after the Fall and the age of accountability. What is the primitive condition of Adam and Eve? They live in a magnificent garden, without care or toil, eating the fruits of the trees,[2] and they are naked, but without being more ashamed than a child of their nakedness;[3] they do not know how to distinguish good from evil,[4] another characteristic of childhood,[5] or of old age when it has reached a second childhood.[6] The first effect of the Fall is the feeling of shame: the eyes of Adam and Eve are opened, they see that they are naked, and they make themselves girdles.[7] This, Umbreit says, is meant to suggest in a subtle and delicate manner that observation of the distinction of sex and recognition of the woman by the man produce the condition necessary to reproduction in the human pair.[8]

Here, then, are Adam and Eve arrived at conscious maturity and puberty. The consequences for the woman are the pains of pregnancy and childbirth, as well as submission to her husband;[9] she now has a right to the title Eve (life) having become the mother of the living.[10] As for man, he is condemned to the laborious cultiva-

[1] Chap. iii. [2] Gen. ii. 16. [3] Gen. ii. 25. [4] Gen. iii. 5.
[5] Deut. i. 39; Isa. vii. 15 f. [6] 2 Sam. xix. 35. [7] Gen. iii. 7.
[8] *Die Sünde*, pp. 21 f. [9] Gen. iii. 16. [10] Gen. iii. 20.

tion of an unresponsive soil all his life.[1] They both attain superior knowledge, the knowledge of good and evil, which is the prerogative of divinity,[2] and they are driven from paradise forever.[3] It is clear that the sacred author had in view the two principal stages of human life, childhood and the age of accountability, in describing the original condition of man and his situation after the Fall.

Let us complete this picture by adding some new touches. Among the trees of paradise is the tree of life;[4] man could at first eat freely of its fruit;[5] but after the fall he is forbidden it lest he should live forever.[6] God had forbidden man to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil under penalty of death;[7] he did not wish that he should attain to such knowledge,[8] but that he should remain under his tutelage. He punishes him with death and all the ills of life for having disobeyed his command.

The thought of our author, then, is this: man when created by God was as innocent as a child and as happy withal; God wished that he should remain in this condition of childish dependence and simplicity, exempt from the cares and sufferings of life; but man preferred to eat of the forbidden fruit and attain higher knowledge; thus God's original plan was disturbed and replaced by the present state of things, in which man is more intelligent but less happy. As for the chief object of the story, it is to show the origin, not of sin, moral evil, but of physical evil, the ills of life, and to prove that

[1] Gen. iii. 17–19, 23. [2] Gen. iii. 5, 22; comp. 2 Sam. xiv. 17.
[3] Gen. iii. 23 f. [4] Gen. ii. 9. [5] Gen. ii. 16.
[6] Gen. iii. 22, 24. [7] Gen. ii. 17; iii. 3. [8] Gen. iii. 22.

not God, but human sin, is the cause of these evils.[1] Bruch justly remarks that the author of our story allowed himself to be guided by the twofold thought that physical evil is the result of sin, and that sin is connected with civilization; and that he derived these ideas from memory and observation, which tell us that the child is happy so long as he remains in the condition of ignorance and innocence, while the development of the spirit and of life produces disordered instincts and desires that engender most evils.[2]

The questions whence sin came and how man, coming from the hands of the Creator, could fall into sin, seem not to have existed for our author. The Old Testament as a whole attributes to man freedom to choose between good and evil. Our author also attributed the same freedom to the protoplasts; this is clear from what he says of them. Hence it could not occur to him to explain the origin of sin, the possibility of sinning being implied in the freedom of man. The transition from the possibility of sin to its realization was, moreover, favored by the external circumstances in which God had placed man. It was God, in fact, who had planted in the midst of the Garden of Eden the tree of knowledge of good and evil. It was he who had created the serpent and permitted him to stay in paradise.[3] The account of the Fall describes simply the starting-point of sin in the human bosom. In this sense it may be said to explain the origin of sin, but not in that of revealing its source or primal cause. It does

[1] Rothe, *Dogmatik*, I. pp. 302 f.

[2] *Weisheitslehre der Hebräer*, pp. 92 f.; [Wellhausen, *History*, pp. 300 ff.].

[3] Gen. iii. 1.

not reach this cause. It confines itself to the external circumstances which furnished our first parents with an occasion for sin, by summoning them to make use of their freedom.

What our author wished least of all to explain, though the contrary has been asserted, is the origin of the innate inclination to evil. On the one hand, he grants the existence of this inclination even in Adam and Eve, so readily do they yield to the solicitations of the serpent; he seems to find it perfectly natural that the woman should have coveted the forbidden fruit after the serpent had induced her to eat of it.[1] On the other hand, he considers Cain as free as his father before the Fall and perfectly capable of repelling evil.[2] The only change produced by the Fall affects man's knowledge, in which respect he has gained much, since discernment between good and evil was a great advance;[3] it affects, moreover, the external condition of man, who has lost much, in that, having at first been happy, he has become miserable. As for moral power, as we have just seen, it has not been changed in the least.[4] Nor does the Old Testament as a whole say more than this story about a change produced in the moral nature of man as a result of Adam's sin, since outside of this story there is never any reference to the fall of Adam or a fall of humanity, but it is taken for granted that man is free to do good and shun evil.

This is doubtless the reason, this and the fact of its essential practical tendency, why prophetism did not

[1] Gen. iii. 6. [2] Gen. iv. 7.
[3] Gen. iii. 5, 22; 2 Sam. xiv. 17; 1 Kings iii. 9.
[4] Comp. Schultz, II. pp. 301 f.

feel the need of giving attention to the origin of sin. The question is hardly raised except in the book of Job. It sees the cause of the sinful condition of man in his natural weakness, his earthly origin, his descent from unclean parents.[1] Thus even in this comparatively speculative and theoretical book Israelitish thought remains essentially empirical; it does not feel the need of going back to the causes or first and metaphysical reasons for moral evil.

## § 20. THE GUILT OF SIN.

The feeling of guilt was very fully developed in Israel. It is admirably expressed in the first four penitential psalms,[2] and in many another passage. Everywhere in the Old Testament we see sinners filled with the feeling of guilt seeking the forgiveness of God. Since moral freedom was attributed to man, his responsibility, and consequently, in case of unfaithfulness, his guilt, naturally appeared very great. Guilt is frequently designated by the same terms as sin itself. Yet the Hebrew language also has a peculiar term to express it; *viz. asham* and its derivatives.[3]

The Old Testament generally represents sin as a conscious and voluntary transgression of the will of God; but it teaches that man is also guilty and should offer a guilt offering when he has sinned involuntarily, by mistake or in ignorance.[4] Thus it appears that there

[1] iv. 17–19; xiv. 1–4; xv. 14; xxv. 4–6; comp. Ps. ciii. 12–14.

[2] vi., xxxii., xxxviii., li.

[3] Gen. xxvi. 10; xlii. 21; 2 Sam. xiv. 13; Hos. v. 15; xiii. 1; Zech. xi. 5; Ezek. xxii. 4; etc.

[4] Lev. iv., v. 14–19; Num. xv. 22 ff., 27 ff.

is guilt every time the divine commands have been violated, whether this violation has been intentional or not, and that even in the latter case reparation is due to the sacred majesty of God. It is clear that, in this view, the principle in accordance with which God takes note of the heart, the intention, is not sufficiently protected; that more importance is assigned to the external act than to the internal disposition. But it should be noticed that this conception appears in document C, in which Levitical purity generally much outranks moral purity. It is a fruit of Levitism, not of prophetism. In other documents, it is true, we encounter passages which allow that man may be guilty on account of sins committed by his ancestors,[1] and even that he may be punished for faults of others without regard to ties of nature in either direction.[2] On the other hand, the guilty may be spared or blessed on account of the righteousness of other men.[3]

The Old Testament, then, allows the transfer both of guilt and righteousness from one person or generation to another, the imputation of the merits and demerits of other persons. This arises from the fact that in Israel as in antiquity in general, the idea of solidarity was very fully developed;[4] the individual was sacrificed

[1] Ex. xx. 5; xxxiv. 7; Lev. xxvi. 39; Num. xiv. 18; Deut. v. 9; Amos vii. 16 f.; Hos. iv. 6; Jer. ii. 9; xxxii. 18; Lam. v. 7; Isa. xiv. 21; lxv. 6, 7; Job xxi. 19; Dan. ix. 16; Ps. cix. 14.

[2] Deut. i. 37; iii. 26; iv. 21; 2 Kings xxiii. 26; xxiv. 3 f.; Jer. xv. 4; Isa. liii.

[3] Gen. xviii. 26 ff.; Deut. ix. 26 f.; 1 Kings xi. 13, 32, 34, 36; xv. 3–5; 2 Kings viii. 19; xix. 34; xx. 6; Jer. v. 1; Job xlii. 8.

[4] Gen. xx. 9; xxvi. 10; Num. xvi. 25–33; Josh. vii.; 2 Sam. xxi. 1–14; xxiv. 1 ff.

to the community. The old covenant, in fact, was a covenant beween God and Israel taken collectively, and not a covenant with individuals; they were little accounted in comparison with the family, the tribe, or the nation. It is, moreover, a matter of experience that children often suffer for the faults of their fathers. But it is not right to conclude that, therefore, the children are as guilty as they and of their faults; they are much more to be pitied than blamed. Hävernick[1] and Oehler[2] remind us also that vices easily propagate themselves in the same family. We do not, however, believe with these two scholars that this is the consideration that gave rise to the view expressed Ex. xx. 5, and elsewhere, where it is said that God visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children. It is our modern individualism that attributes to the sacred authors this way of thinking, because we have difficulty in believing that God punishes the righteous instead of the guilty. The ancients, being much less individualistic than we, had not the same scruples. Oehler, in defence of his statement, says that the passages in question are very imperfectly understood "when they are made to say that God visits the sins of the fathers upon innocent children, and that he causes the blessing of pious fathers to rest upon their most degenerate descendants." It is certain that the sacred authors thought neither of innocent children nor completely degenerate descendants. But they had just as little thought that the children and descendants had sinned like their parents and ancestors, and been punished for that reason, as Oehler would have it. The truth is that they ignored

[1] *Theologie*, p. 113. [2] § 75.

the moral worth of the descendants and believed in heredity of merit and demerit. Because these passages mean that God punishes or blesses children for their fathers, without regard to their own conduct and moral worth, a feeling of justice afterwards arose in opposition to this way of thinking and gave rise to the conviction that each one was punished only for his own sins.[1]

The above discussion proves that the traditional doctrine of original sin, which teaches the heredity of the guilt of Adam, finds some support in the Old Testament, although it nowhere says that the guilt of Adam was transmitted to his descendants or even to the whole human race. It allows, in fact, that guilt may be transmitted and sometimes is transmitted from father to son, and from one generation to another. On the other hand, however, it cannot be said to favor the doctrine teaching that the natural state of man is a state of guilt, that the innate inclination to evil renders man worthy of eternal damnation from his birth. The Old Testament, on the contrary, sees in this native evil inclination an extenuating circumstance which the sinner may plead before God. The book of Job asks that God be not too strict with man, on account of his natural weakness; that he exercise forbearance toward him, because it is impossible that a pure man should spring from an impure one.[2] One of the psalmists also alleges as a reason that should procure him forgiveness with God the fact that he was conceived and born in sin.[3] Another psalmist says that God has compassion

[1] Jer. xxxi. 29 f.; Ezek. xviii; xxxiii. 10–20; Deut. xxiv. 16; 2 Kings xiv. 6; Prov. ix. 12.

[2] xiv. 1–4; comp. xiii. 25 f.; x. 8–14; vii. 12–21. [3] Ps. li. 5.

on those who fear him, as a father has compassion on his children, because he knows our origin, and remembers that we are dust.[1] Even in document A, God promises not to curse the earth on account of man, because the designs of his heart are evil from his youth.[2] According to deutero-Isaiah God would not contend and be angry forever, because the spirit and the souls of his creatures faint in his presence.[3]

We see that these passages give to the natural weakness of man, whether physical or moral, the force of a reason that should secure for him the divine forbearance. This view is unquestionably much more correct than the orthodox doctrine of native and hereditary guilt.

## § 21. THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.

The prophets generally first set forth the unfaithfulnesses of Israel, as well as those of other peoples, and afterward the day of judgment, when the penalties decreed will break upon the guilty. This day is often called the day of Jehovah.[4] Then, in fact, will be displayed more clearly than ever his supreme power, and he will triumph over his enemies;[5] then also he will be known and glorified by the whole world.[6] It will be a day of extraordinary terror, causing commotion in

[1] Ps. ciii. 13 f. [2] Gen. viii. 21. [3] Isa. lvii. 16.

[4] Amos v. 18, 20; Zeph. i. 7, 14; Zech. iv. 1; Isa. xiii. 6, 9; Ezek. xiii. 5; xxx. 3; Joel i. 15; ii. 1. 11, 31; iii. 14; Ob. 15.

[5] Isa. ii. 12 ff.; v. 15 f.; Jer. xlvi. 10; etc.

[6] Isa. xix. 21 f.; xlix. 26; Ezek. vi. 7, 10; xi. 10, 12; xii. 15 f., 20; xxii. 15 f.; xxv. 5, 7, 11, 17; xxvi. 6; xxviii. 22–24; xxix. 6, 9, 16; xxx. 8, 19, 25 f.; xxxii. 15; xxxiii. 29; xxxviii. 16, 22 f.; xxxix. 6 f., 13, 21 f., 28; Joel iii. 14–17.

heaven and earth.[1] It will put an end to the present world, and open a new era, as is indicated by the term *acharith-hayyamim*, the end of the days, by which it is designated,[2] and as is suggested by the description of the coming of the Messianic kingdom with which we shall soon become acquainted. The prophets for the most part thought that this day was nigh.[3] They saw in every striking public misfortune the prelude to the day of judgment, and in every extraordinary deliverance the commencement of the Messianic era.[4] As the fulfilment of these predictions was delayed, many of the Israelites were led to make sport of the prophetic visions and discourses.[5]

The punishment foretold to Israel by almost all the prophets is destruction, oppression, and captivity. The foreign peoples will serve as instruments in the hands of God in executing this penalty. Since the prophets generally allow themselves to be guided in their predictions by the political condition of their time, the oldest of our prophetical books foretell that it will be chiefly the Assyrians and the Egyptians who will inflict upon Israel the penalties merited by their unfaithfulness.[6] From Jeremiah on, the Chaldeans under

[1] Amos viii. 8 f.; Isa. ii. 9 ff., 19 ff.; xiii. 6 ff.; xxiv. 17 ff.; Hab. iii. 3 ff.; Ezek. xxxii. 7 ff.; xxxviii. 19 ff.; Hag. ii. 6, 21 f.; Joel ii. 30 f.; iii. 14 f.

[2] Gen. xlix. 1; Num. xxiv. 14; Hos. iii. 5; Isa. ii. 2; Jer. xxx. 24; xlviii. 47; Ezek. xxxviii. 8, 16.

[3] Mic. vii. 4; Zeph. i. 7, 14; Isa. x. 25; xiii. 6, 9, 22; xxix. 17; Ezek. xxx. 3; xxxvi. 8; Hag. ii. 6; Joel i. 15; ii. 1; iii. 14; Ob. 15.

[4] Oehler, § 215; Schultz, II. pp. 356 f.

[5] Ezek. xii. 22–28; comp. Isa. xxviii. 14 ff.

[6] Hos. viii. 13; ix. 3, 6; x. 6; xi. 5, 11; Isa. vii. 17 ff.; viii. 4 ff.; xi. 11 ff.; Mic. vii. 12.

the leadership of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, are regarded as destined to be the chief instruments of these penalties.[1] Besides the sword, Jehovah will employ famine, pestilence, and other plagues in punishing the unfaithful people.[2]

Most frequently the prophets represent the judgment as a complete destruction, because they have in view the majority of the guilty people. But in reality they thought that a remnant would escape the catastrophe. Even Amos teaches that the judgment will rather be a sorting: the good will be separated from the wicked; the latter will perish; the others, a small remnant, a tenth of the mass of the nation, will return, after having been carried into captivity, to their country.[3] In one passage, characteristic in this respect, Isaiah foretells that the cities will be devastated and stripped of inhabitants, until there will be no one in the houses, and the country will be a solitude, a desert; that, if there remain a tenth of the inhabitants they in their turn will be annihilated. The overthrow, then, seems to be complete. Yet the passage closes with these words: "As the terebinth and the oak retain their stump, when they are cut down, another posterity shall spring from this people."[4] Thus the present guilty generation must disappear, but to give place to a new and pure one. The judgment may also be compared to the harvesting of grain and the gathering of olives, in which all is car-

[1] Jer. xx. 4 ff.; xxii. 25; xxv. 9–11; xxvii. 12–22; xxxii. 24 f., 36; xxxiv. 2 f., 21; xxxvii. 17; Hab. i. 6 ff.; Ezek. xxiii. 22 f.; xvii. 12 ff.; xii. 13.

[2] Jer. xiv. 12, 16, 18; xv. 2 f.; xvi. 4; xxix. 17 f.; xxxii. 24, 36; Ezek. v. 16 f.; vi. 11 f.; vii. 15; xxxiii. 27.

[3] v. 3, 15; ix. 8–10, 14 f.

[4] Isa. vi. 11–13.

ried away except a small remnant of gleanings and scattered berries.[1] Elsewhere we learn that the judgment is not to result in the total extermination of the people Israel,[2] but that they are to be made to pass through the crucible of trial, that all the impure elements may be eliminated.[3] Thus in numerous prophetic passages there is reference to a remnant that will escape the catastrophe of the judgment and be the nucleus of the new people of God.[4] We shall discuss it farther on.

But the judgment is not to affect Israel alone; it is to be executed against the heathen peoples also. Amos, at the beginning of his book, speaking for Jehovah, foretells destruction to the peoples adjoining Israel; the Syrians, the Philistines, the Phœnicians, the Edomites, the Ammonites, guilty of crimes against Israel, and the Moabites, who have outraged a king of Edom.[5] After him, most of the prophets, along with threats against Israel, utter threats against the heathen peoples, foretelling the judgment and the penalties of God which will overtake them as the reward of their wickedness. In the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, is found a series of chapters that contain only predictions of this kind.[6] They are chiefly directed against the peoples adjoining Palestine, with whom Israel maintained relations.

[1] Isa. xvii. 4–6.

[2] Jer. iv. 27; v. 10, 18; Zech. xiii. 8; xiv. 2; Isa. lxv. 8 f.

[3] Isa. i. 25; Ezek. ix. 4 ff.; xx. 38; Zech. xiii. 7–9; Mal. iii. 1 ff.

[4] Isa. i. 9; iv. 3; x. 20–22; xi. 11, 16; xxiv. 6; xxviii. 5; xxxvii. 31 f.; xli. 14; xlix. 6; Jer. vi. 9; xxiii. 3; xxxi. 7; Ezek. vi. 8 f.; xii. 16; xiv. 22; Mic. ii. 12; v. 6 f.; Zeph. ii. 9; iii. 12 f.; Deut. iv. 27.

[5] i. 3–ii. 3.

[6] Isa. xiii.–xxi., xxiii.–xxvii.; Jer. xxv. 9–38; xxvii. 2–11; xliii. 8–13; xlvi.–li.; Ezek. xxv.–xxxii., xxxv., xxxviii. f.

Jehovah, whose eye watches foreign nations as well as the tribes of Israel, feels offended by the proud might of these nations and undertakes to break it.[1] He would humble all that is exalted that he alone may be exalted.[2] Assyria, in particular, which has served as a rod in the hands of God to punish Israel, has grown proud of its power and its successes, and has forgotten its dependence as regards God; it must, therefore, be humiliated by overthrow.[3] Babylon, also, to which Jehovah has delivered his people, has abused its power and been merciless toward the captive Israelites; it has become proud, and placed its confidence in wickedness; it has, therefore, merited overthrow.[4]

Besides, the heathen peoples appear as the enemies of Jehovah and his people; so that God, on account of his jealousy, believes himself obliged to punish them in order to revenge himself and his people.[5] God is angry with them also for the wickedness that they have practised toward others and especially toward Israel.[6] What further incites him against them is their idolatry.[7] The nations and kingdoms that do not serve Jehovah must be exterminated.[8]

[1] Zech. ix. 1–6; i. 15; Hab. ii. 4 ff.; Ob. 3 ff.; Isa. xiv. 13 ff.; xvi. 6; xxiii. 9; xxv. 11; xxvi. 5; Jer. xlviii. 29 ff.; xlix. 16 ff.; l. 31 ff.; Ezek. xxvii. 1 ff.; xxviii. 1 ff.; xxix. 2 ff., 9 ff.; xxx. 18; xxxi. 1 ff., 10 ff. [2] Isa. ii. 11 ff.; v. 15 f.; xxxiii. 10.

[3] Isa. x. 5 ff.; xxxvii. 21–29. [4] Isa. xlvii.

[5] Nah. i. 2 ff.; Jer. xlviii. 26, 42; l. 14 f., 24, 28 f., 34; li. 6, 11, 36; Isa. xxxv. 4; xlvii. 3; lxiii. 4; Zech. i. 14 f.; Joel iii. 21.

[6] Nah. ii. 1 ff.; iii. 1 ff.; Zeph. ii. 8 ff.; Hab. ii. 9 ff.; Zech. xii. 9; xiv. 12; Jer. xii. 14; xlviii. 27; l. 17 f.; li. 24; Ezek. xxv. 3 ff., 8 ff., 12 ff., 15 ff.; xxvi. 2 ff.; xxxv. 5 ff., 10 ff.; xxxvi. 2 ff.; xxxviii f.; Isa. xiv. 4 ff.; xli. 11 f.; xlix. 25; li. 22 f.; Joel iii. 1 ff., 19; Ob. 10 ff.

[7] Jer. l. 38 ff.; li. 47, 52. [8] Isa. lx. 12; Jer. xii. 17.

God executes his judgment against the heathen peoples by choosing the most powerful among them to destroy the others. Egypt and especially Assyria are first called to play this part, as they did toward Israel;[1] later it is the Chaldeans, led by Nebuchadnezzar,[2] then the other peoples, previously governed by the Chaldeans;[3] and chiefly the Medes and Persians under King Cyrus.[4] Sometimes also God exterminates a people by civil wars.[5] Or perhaps Israel, after having been oppressed by foreign peoples, repay them in kind.[6] Finally, God interferes directly by prodigies and extraordinary plagues.[7]

We see, in fine, that the judgment of God upon the world is executed by natural means, especially by wars; but by reason of the theocratic standpoint adopted in Israel, the advancement of the principal Asiatic peoples of this period and their final humiliation are regarded as produced by God himself, who thus realizes his purposes respecting all the nations of the earth and particularly respecting his peculiar people. We see also that, to the prophets, the world is equivalent to the peoples who came within their narrow geographical and political horizon.

[1] Isa. vii. 18 ff.; viii. 4 ff.; xx. 1 ff.; xxiii. 13.

[2] Hab. i. 5 ff.; Jer. xxv. 9–11; xxvii. 2–6; xliii. 8–13; xlvi. ff.; Ezek. xxvi. 7 ff.; xxix. 18 ff.; xxx. 10 ff., 24 ff.; xxxii. 11.

[3] Hab. ii. 8; Jer. xxv. 12 ff.; xxvii. 7.

[4] Isa. xliii. 14; xlv. 1 ff.; xlviii. 14; xiii.; xxi. 1 ff.; Jer. l. f.

[5] Isa. xix. 2 ff.; Zech. xiv. 13.

[6] Mic. iv. 13; Zeph. ii. 9; Zech. xii. 6; ii. 8 f.; Joel iii. 8; Ob. 18.

[7] Mic. vii. 15; Zeph. ii. 12; Hab. iii. 1 ff.; Zech. xii. 4; xiv. 3 f., 12 ff.; Ezek. xxviii. 23; xxxviii. 20, 22; Isa. xiii. 9 ff.; lxvi. 15 f.; Joel iii. 14 ff.

## § 22. SALVATION.

### I. *The Restoration of Israel under the New Covenant.*

Jehovah cannot completely and forever cast off his people; he cannot deal with them according to his wrath; when he sees them in distress, he is touched with compassion, as a mother pities the fruit of her bowels.[1] He is, moreover, bound by oaths that he has sworn to the fathers.[2] Finally, he cannot abandon his people, on account of his name, which is profaned among the heathen nations and which must be sanctified by the restoration of Israel, that these nations may become acquainted with Jehovah and know that it is he who has upraised that which was thrown down and planted that which was laid waste.[3]

We have seen that the judgment of God is not to result in the complete extermination of Israel; that, on the contrary, a small remnant will escape. With this remnant Jehovah will make a new and an everlasting covenant.[4] It will be a new Israel, which will really be the people of Jehovah, and of which Jehovah will be the God.[5]

But to this end the people must fulfil certain conditions. They must profit by the chastisements endured; they must confess their faults; they must return to Je-

[1] Hos. xi. 8 f.; Isa. xlix. 15 f.; Jer. xxxi. 3 ff. [2] Mic. vii. 20.

[3] 1 Sam. xii. 22; Ezek. xxxvi. 22–36; Isa. xlviii. 9, 11.

[4] Hos. ii. 14 ff.; Jer. xxxi. 31–37; xxxii. 40; l. 5; Ezek. xvi. 60, 62; xxxiv. 25; xxxvii. 26; Isa. xlii. 6; xlix. 8; liv. 5–10; lxi. 8.

[5] Hos. i. 10; ii. 23; Jer. xxiv. 7; xxx. 22; xxxi. 1, 33; xxxii. 38; Ezek. xi. 20; xiv. 11; xxxiv. 24, 30; xxxvi. 28; xxxvii. 23, 27; Zech. xiii. 9; viii. 7 f.

hovah and humbly ask his forgiveness.[1] Jehovah does not desire that his people should die, perish; he desires their conversion, that is to say, that they should live and be saved.[2] He will, on their repentance, grant his people a full pardon.[3] He will pour his spirit upon the new Israel,[4] the members of which will be taught by himself.[5] The whole land will be filled with the knowledge of Jehovah.[6] God will give to his people a new spirit; he will replace their stony heart with a heart of flesh; he will imprint upon it his law and his fear, that he may render it fit to fulfil his commands.[7] Thus will be formed a holy, righteous, faithful people, fearing God, purified by him from all stains.[8] Idolatry and every superstition will disappear from the midst of his people.[9] According to Ezekiel, an ecclesiastical will correspond to this religious and moral regeneration; Jerusalem will have a splendid sanctuary, a Levitical worship well regulated and free from all impurity;

[1] Hos. xiv. 1 f.; Isa. i. 27; x. 20 ff.; Jer. iii. 14, 22 ff.; xxiv. 7; xxix. 13; xxxi. 9, 18 f.; l. 4 f.; Ezek. vi. 9; xvi. 61–63; xx. 43; xxxvi. 31; Deut. iv. 30; xxx. 1 f., 8.

[2] Ezek. xviii. 23, 30–32; xxxiii. 11.

[3] Mic. vii. 18 f.; Isa. xxxiii. 24; xliii. 25; xliv. 22; lv. 7; Jer. xxxi. 34; xxxiii. 8; l. 20; Ezek. xvi. 63; Zech. iii. 9; v. 5 ff.

[4] Isa. xxxii. 15; xlii. 1; xliv. 3; lix. 21; Ezek. xxxvi. 27; xxxix. 29; Joel. ii. 28 f.

[5] Isa. liv. 13; Jer. xxxi. 34.

[6] Isa. xi. 9; Jer. xxxi. 34.

[7] Jer. xxiv. 7; xxxi. 33; xxxii. 39 f.; Ezek. xi. 19 f.; xxxvi. 26 f.; Deut. xxx. 6.

[8] Isa. i. 26 f.; iv. 3 f.; vi. 13; xxvi. 2; xxxii. 16; xxxv. 8; lii. 1; lx. 17 f., 21; lxii. 12; Jer. xxxi. 23; Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 33; xxxvii. 23 f.; xliii. 7; Ob. 17; Zeph. iii. 9, 13; Zech. v. 1–4; viii. 3; xiii. 9; xiv. 20 f.; Joel iii. 17.

[9] Isa. xxx. 22; xxxi. 17; Ezek. xi. 18; xxxvii. 23; Hos. ii. 17; xiv. 8; Mic. v. 12–14; Zech. ix. 7; xiii. 2.

there will reign a state of things entirely new and truly ideal.[1] A number of other prophets, especially among the latest, also express the hope that the Levitical worship will maintain its importance under the new covenant.[2]

Then Jehovah will again dwell in Zion, in the midst of his people, of whom he will be the king and the saviour.[3] He will gather about him the Israelites scattered among the heathen nations.[4] The most cordial union and agreement will ever reign between the kingdom of Israel and the kingdom of Judah, which will be subject to one and the same head, a descendant of David.[5] The king of this new Israel will be surrounded by great glory.[6] He and his princes will govern in righteousness and uprightness.[7] This wonderful restoration appears to the eyes of the prophets like a veritable resurrection.[8]

The new people of God will multiply extraordinarily and extend themselves afar.[9] They will be strong and

[1] Chaps. xl.–xlviii.

[2] Zech. xiv. 16 ff.; Jer. xxxi. 14; xxxiii. 18, 21 f.; Isa. xix. 21; lvi. 7; lx. 13; lxvi. 21, 23; Mal. i. 11; iii. 3 f.

[3] Mic. ii. 13; iv. 7; Zeph. iii. 15, 17; Ezek. xxxvii. 27; xliii. 7; xlviii. 35; Jer. iii. 17; Isa. xxiv. 23; Joel iii. 17, 21; Zech. ii. 11–13; viii. 3; Mal. iii. 1.

[4] Isa. xi. 11 ff.; xiv. 1; xxvii. 12 f.; xliii. 5–7; xlix. 12, 17–22; lx. 4; lxvi. 20; Jer. iii. 18; xvi. 15; xxiii. 8; xxix. 14; xxx. 3, 10, 18; xxxi. 8, 10; xxxii. 37, 44; xxxiii. 7; Ezek. xi. 17 f.; xxxiv. 12; xxxvi. 24; xxxix. 27; Hos. xi. 10 f.; Amos ix. 14; Mic. ii. 12; iv. 6; Zeph. iii. 18–20; Zech. x. 8 ff.; viii. 7 f.; Deut. xxx. 3–5.

[5] Hos. i. 11; iii. 5; Amos ix. 11; Isa. xi. 13; Jer. iii. 18; xxxi.; l. 4; Ezek. xxxvii. 15 ff., 24 ff.

[6] Isa. xi. 10; xxxiii. 17.

[7] Isa. xxxii. 1; Jer. xxxiii. 15.

[8] Hos. vi. 1–3; xiii. 14; Ezek. xxxvii. 1–14; Isa. xxvi. 18 f.

[9] Isa. ix. 3, 7; xxvi. 15; xxxiii. 17; xlix. 19–21; liv. 2 f.; lx. 22;

happy, and no longer fear foreign powers.[1] They will, on the contrary, subdue the other peoples under their yoke or else destroy them.[2] Other passages say that the foreign peoples will themselves voluntarily submit to the new Israel and serve them.[3] The treasures of the nations will be offered to Israel and to their God.[4] Israel will live in peace and security protected from dangers, and the whole panoply of war will become superfluous.[5] They will enjoy perfect happiness.[6] Universal peace will be established on earth.[7]

What is even more remarkable than all this is that the new era will be inaugurated by a not less extraordinary change that will take place in nature and extend from the stars of heaven to the beasts of the field and the products of the earth. There will be a wonderful abundance of the fruits of the earth, a surprising material prosperity, a state of things so like fairy-land that the desert will be changed into a paradise.[8] God will make

Jer. iii. 16; xxx. 19; xxxi. 27 f.; Ezek. xxxvi. 10 f., 37 f.; xxxvii. 26; xlvii. 15 ff.; Hos. i. 10; Amos ix. 12; Ob. 19 f.; Zech. ii. 4; viii. 4 f.; ix. 10, 17; x. 8.

[1] Isa. ix. 4; liv. 17; lx. 18; Ezek. xxxiv. 28 f.; xxxvi. 15; Joel iii. 17; Mic. v. 5–9; Zech. ix. 8.

[2] Isa. xi. 14; xli. 14–16; xlv. 14; li. 22 f.; lxi. 5; Joel iii. 4–8; Amos ix. 12; Ob. 17–21; Zeph. ii. 4–7, 9; Zech. ix. 13 ff.; x. 5 ff.

[3] Mic. iv. 1–3; Isa. ii. 2–4; xi. 10; xiv. 1 f.; xliv. 5; xlix. 22 f.; lv. 5; lx. 10–14.

[4] Isa. xviii. 7; xxiii. 17 f.; xlv. 14; lx. 5ff., 16 f.; lxi. 6; lxvi. 10 ff.; Zeph. iii. 10; Hag. ii. 7 f.; Zech. xiv. 14.

[5] Isa. iv. 6; xxxii. 16–18; xxxiii. 6; lx. 17 f.; Jer. xxx. 10; xxxii. 27; xxxiii. 16; Ezek. xxviii. 26; xxxiv. 25, 27; xxxvii. 26; Hos. ii. 18; Mic. iv. 4; v. 8 f.; Hag. ii. 9; Zech. ix. 10; xiv. 11.

[6] Isa. ix. 3; li. 3; lxv. 18 f.; Jer. xxx. 19; xxxi. 12–14; xxxiii. 10 f.

[7] Mic. iv. 3; Isa. ii. 4.

[8] Isa. xxx. 23–25; xxxii. 15; xxxv. 1 f., 6 f.; xli. 17–20; xliii. 19 f.;

a covenant with the beasts of the field, the birds of heaven, and the reptiles of the earth,[1] that men may no longer fear them.[2] According to other passages the wild animals will be exterminated for the sake of the safety of men.[3] Every one will attain an advanced age.[4] One prophet even hopes that death will forever be abolished, and that God will also dry all tears.[5] The blind will see, the deaf hear, the dumb speak, the lame leap, and no one will be sick more.[6] The light of the moon will be equal to the brightness of the sun, and the brightness of the sun will be sevenfold greater.[7] According to deutero-Isaiah the light of the sun and the moon will even be replaced by Jehovah, who will serve as a light day and night.[8] There will, then, in reality be new heavens and a new earth.[9]

This state of things, being, as we have seen, based on an everlasting covenant, will naturally have an everlasting duration.[10]

We see that, under the new covenant, there will be a sort of golden age, and that all the imperfections of the old covenant and of the present world will have disappeared. Under the new order of things Israel will

xlix. 10 f.; li. 13; lv. 1 f., 13; lx. 17; Jer. xxxi. 12–14, 24 f.; xxxiii. 12 f.; Ezek. xxxiv. 26 f., 29; xxxvi. 29 f.; xlvii. 1–12; Hos. ii. 21 f.; Joel iii. 18; Amos. ix. 13; Zech. viii. 12; ix. 17; x. 1; xiv. 8, 10.

[1] Hos. ii. 18. [2] Isa. xi. 6–8; lxv. 25.

[3] Ezek. xxxiv. 25, 28; comp. Isa. xxxv. 9; Lev. xxvi. 6.

[4] Isa. lxv. 20; comp. Zech. viii. 4; Ex. xxiii. 26.

[5] Isa. xxv. 8; comp. lxv. 19.

[6] Isa. xxix. 18; xxxiii. 23 f.; xxxv. 5 f.; comp. Ex. xxiii. 25.

[7] Isa. xxx. 26. [8] Isa. lx. 19; comp. xxiv. 23; iv. 5.

[9] Isa. lxv. 17; lxvi. 22.

[10] Jer. vii. 7; xxiv. 6; xxxi. 36, 40; Ezek. xxxvii. 25; Isa. xxxv. 10; lxv. 22; lxvi. 22; Joel iii. 20; Amos ix. 15; Mic. iv. 7.

be faithful in all respects to their God, and consequently enjoy without measure all divine blessings, material and spiritual. It is clear, however, from the above discussion that, in the eyes of the prophets, the future world will not be a celestial, but a terrestrial one, the present world transformed or transfigured.

## II. *The Participation of the Gentiles in the New Covenant.*

The judgment of God against the heathen peoples will not result in their complete extermination. Just as a remnant of Israel will come forth from the judgment purified, to form the nucleus of a new people of Jehovah, so some among the heathen peoples will escape and survive the catastrophe of the judgment.[1] Those who escape will be able to participate in the final salvation, the new covenant, made between Jehovah and the new Israel.

Two passages, almost identical, one found in Isaiah and the other in Micah, which seem to be copied from an older prophetic document, thus early give us a clear glimpse of such a prospect. They say that at the end of the days, *i.e.* at the end of the present era, and in the time of the new covenant, all peoples will flow to the mountain of the house of Jehovah, to be taught in the law, in the word of Jehovah; and then Jehovah will be their judge, their arbiter; they will no more draw the sword against one another, they will not longer learn

[1] Zech. xiv. 16; ix. 6 f.; Jer. xlviii. 42, comp. with *v.* 47; xlix. 1–5, comp. with *v.* 6; Ezek. xlix. 13 ff.; Isa. xlv. 20.

to make war, but they will transform their arms into agricultural implements.[1]

Micah, it is true, does not seem to have completely assimilated the universalism that these words express. He adds immediately afterwards: "While all the peoples walk, each in the name of its god, we will walk in the name of Jehovah, our God, forever and ever."[2]

Micah, then, seems to have admitted that the particularism according to which Jehovah is only the God of Israel, would endure forever. He treats the foreign peoples as enemies and gives us to understand that they will be completely overthrown and governed by Israel. This follows especially from v. 7–9, where he says of the remnant of Jacob that it will fall upon the other peoples as suddenly and unexpectedly as the dew, and will be among them like a lion among the beasts of the forest, like a young lion among the flocks of sheep, that tramples and rends, with none to deliver. Verse 9, in particular, leaves the enemies of Israel no other prospect than that of extermination.

This view is found in other prophetic writings, in which the heathen peoples are treated as enemies of God and Israel, worthy of the most severe penalties, without the least prospect of salvation. It is the dominant view in most of the books of the Old Testament. Salvation is promised to the gentiles only in certain prophetical books, and in some few passages not prophetic.

According to those of the prophets who hope for the salvation of the gentiles, the judgment executed by God will contribute especially to their conversion, by

[1] Isa. ii. 2–4 ; Mic. iv. 1–3. [2] Mic. iv. 5.

making them understand the vanity of idolatry, and acknowledge that Jehovah is the only true God.[1] The deliverance, the restoration, and the new glory of Israel will produce the same salutary effect.[2] The king of the new covenant will be like a banner toward which the heathen nations will turn.[3] The superiority of the law and the word of Jehovah will beget among them the desire to be instructed therein.[4] Jehovah will in fact establish his law that it may be the light of the peoples.[5] Deutero-Isaiah rises to a standpoint almost evangelical, when he teaches that the servant of Jehovah, *i.e.* the faithful portion of Israel,[6] will publish righteousness to all the nations and establish it upon the whole earth; that he will everywhere make known the true religion, consisting in the observance of the law, the practice of righteousness;[7] that he will be the light of the nations, and will carry salvation to the ends of the earth.[8] He hopes also that those of the heathen peoples who escape, after having become acquainted with the glory of Jehovah as a judge, will be sent by him to the remote nations and islands that have never heard of him, that they may there establish his glory.[9]

Sometimes there is reference only to the conversion

[1] Isa. xix. 21 f.; xxv. 2 f.; xlv. 5 f., 14; xlix. 26; Zeph. ii. 11; Jer. xvi. 19–21; Ezek. xxv. 7, 11, 17; xxvi. 6; xxviii. 22–24; xxix. 9; xxx. 8, 19, 25 f.; xxxii. 15; xxxviii. 16, 22 f.; xxxix. 6 f.

[2] Mic. vii. 15–17; Jer. xxxiii. 9; Ezek. xxxvi. 23, 36; xxxvii. 28; Isa. xlv. 16 ff.; lii. 10; lv. 5; lxi. 9, 11; lxii. 2 f.; 1 Kings viii. 59 f.; Ps. lxvii. 1 f.

[3] Isa. xi. 10, 12.

[4] Isa. ii. 3; Mic. iv. 2; Deut. iv. 6, 8.

[5] Isa. li. 4.

[6] See § 24.

[7] Isa. xlii. 1, 3 f.

[8] Isa. xlii. 6; xlix. 6.

[9] Isa. lxvi. 18 f.; comp. Zech. viii. 21 f.

of some peoples. Thus Isaiah foretells the conversion of the Assyrians and the Egyptians, who will make a covenant with Israel, and form with them the people of Jehovah.[1] But most frequently the prophets express the hope that the heathen nations in general will turn to Jehovah and participate in salvation.[2] Nevertheless they foresee exceptions; there will be gentiles who will not turn to Jehovah and serve him; they will be punished and exterminated by God.[3]

In these predictions of a universal salvation Israelitish prophecy attained its culmination. There are, however, as we have seen, only certain of the prophets who announce these universalistic hopes, and even they stop short of absolute universalism; they do not completely renounce particularism; they claim for Israel, for all time, great advantages over the other peoples.

First of all, Jerusalem will remain the religious centre of humanity. Thither the peoples will betake themselves to be taught in the law and the word of Jehovah.[4] This thought is really very natural. The prophets were convinced that Israel possessed the true religion. History has justified them; religious truth and the salvation of the world have come from this people.[5] They therefore had a right to declare that other nations would come to Jerusalem to be taught in saving truth. In so doing they maintained in substance the same proposition that the Christians do when

[1] Isa. xviii. 7 ; xix. 18–23.

[2] Isa. ii. 2 ff. ; xxv. 3, 6 f. ; xlii. 1, 4, 6 ; xlv. 22 f. ; xlix. 6 ; li. 4 f. ; lv. 5 ; lvi. 7 ; lxvi. 23 ; Mic. iv. 1 ff. ; Zeph. ii. 11 ; iii. 9 ; Jer. iii. 17 ; xvi. 19 ; Zech. ii. 11 ; viii. 22 f. ; xiv. 16 ; Ps. xxii. 27 ff. ; lxvii. 3 ff. ; cii. 22.

[3] Zech. xiv. 17–19 ; Jer. xii. 17 ; Isa. lx. 12.

[4] Isa. ii. 2 f. ; Mic. iv. 1 f.

[5] Comp. John iv. 22.

they assert that the heathen, to attain salvation, must be converted to Christianity. There is only this difference, that Christians understand that they must go through the whole earth to preach the gospel to all human creatures, while the prophets, whose geographical horizon was less extended, thought that all the peoples could without difficulty come to Jerusalem to be taught in the law and in the service of the true God.

The prophets, besides, give utterance to the thought that the sanctuary at Jerusalem is the only place to which the converted gentiles should bring their offerings and their sacrifices, and that they should there celebrate the feasts in honor of Jehovah, and call upon his name.[1] Isaiah, however, admits that the Egyptians may erect in their own country an altar to Jehovah, to offer sacrifices on it.[2] An analogous view is perhaps expressed elsewhere.[3] In any case it is very rare.

What most offends us in these present predictions is that the people Israel are to remain, under the new covenant, the political centre and aristocracy of the kingdom of God. And it is well known that this is not a secondary thought, from the standpoint of the Old Testament, in which religion generally has a very pronounced national character. The prophets foretell that after the restoration Israel will be found at the head of the other peoples, that the latter will be, as it were, their servants, that they will bring back from

[1] Isa. xviii. 7; xxv. 6 f.; lvi. 5–7; lx. 7, 13; lxvi. 20, 23; Zech. xiv. 16 ff.; Jer. iii. 17; Hag. ii. 7 f.; 1 Kings viii. 41–43.

[2] xviii., xix., xxi.

[3] Mal. i. 11; Zeph. ii. 11; comp., however, iii. 10.

foreign countries their scattered members, that they will bring their riches to them, will rebuild their cities for them, and so forth.[1] The Israelites, as compared with foreigners, will be priests of Jehovah, eating the riches of the nations and glorying in their glory.[2] It should be observed that these last hopes are found chiefly in deutero-Isaiah, who on the whole rose to a purer spiritualism and a broader universalism than the other prophets.

It follows from the above that it is a strange misconception of the character of the prophets' teaching to find in it evangelical ideas concerning the salvation of the world. It is at most the germs of these ideas that are found there. We have seen that the salvation of Israel is there regarded as the perfect realization of the terrestrial theocracy which was the aim of the law and the prophets. Now the salvation of the gentiles will consist in their incorporation into this theocracy, yet with this restriction, that they will occupy only a subordinate rank, that they will be, as it were, the serfs or vassals of Israel.

## § 23. THE MESSIAH.

The prevailing view among the prophets is that Jehovah himself will direct the events of the new covenant, that he will execute judgment and accomplish salvation. This is altogether conformable to the theocratic view maintained in the Old Testament and

[1] Isa. xiv. 2; xxiii. 18; xlv. 14; xlix. 22 f.; lv. 3–5; lx. 3–17; lxi. 5; lxvi. 20.

[2] Isa. lxi. 5 f.

especially by the early Israelites, who would recognize no other king than Jehovah.[1]

Later, however, a legitimate monarchy had succeeded in establishing itself in the midst of the people of Jehovah; then the thought arose that under the new covenant also a king, sprung from the ancient royal family, would occupy the throne of Israel. This king is generally called the Messiah, the Anointed of God, though this name is not given to him in the Old Testament. It must, however, be observed that he is referred to only in a small number of passages. Several prophets do not mention him at all. Christian theology, it is true, which has given to the Messiah an importance much greater than Israelitish prophetism did, has held that he appears in a series of passages in which there is no reference to him. We shall not undertake to pass in review all these passages for the sake of correcting the traditional interpretation. It has been done in numerous works.[2] It is only necessary to set forth the prophetic teaching to show to all unprejudiced minds that this teaching differs from that of the New Testament on the same subject, and that in identifying the one with the other great violence is done to historical truth.

Amos is content with saying that under the new covenant Jehovah will raise up the house of David, that he will repair its breaches, that he will restore its ruins, that he will rebuild it as it was before.[3] Hosea

[1] Jud. viii. 22 f. ; 1 Sam. viii. 5–8 ; x. 18 f.

[2] See especially Baur, *Gesch. der Alttestam. Weissagung;* Anger, *Gesch. der Messianischen Idee;* Hitzig, *Messianische Weissagung.*

[3] ix. 12.

also hopes for the restoration of the house of David; he says that in the new order of things the children of Israel will seek Jehovah their God and David their king.[1] The restoration of the house, the dynasty, of David, is in fact the essence of the Messianic hope of Israel and the prophets, and not the sending of a person, a unique king, as has generally been believed in the Christian church.

Thus Jeremiah teaches, in the most explicit manner, that, in the Messianic era, an uninterrupted series of kings, princes, will occupy the throne of David; that the posterity of David will be multiplied, in order that he may never want a successor;[2] that Jehovah will appoint over the remnant of the sheep of Israel, gathered from all countries, shepherds who will feed them.[3] Ezekiel is in perfect accord with Jeremiah on this subject. According to him also, the house of Israel will be governed by a series of kings, after the glorious restoration which he foretells; the prince who occupies the throne will have sons who will mount it after him.[4] It will be with the royal house, overthrown by the catastrophe of the Exile, as with a broken cedar, of which a branch, replanted, will grow and become a great tree.[5] This means that a new line of princes will spring from the old royal house, the house of David.

It is true that the same prophets sometimes seem to speak of a single king who will rule over the new Israel. Jeremiah and Ezekiel say that Jehovah will raise up David his servant that he may be king over Israel

[1] iii. 5. [2] xvii. 25; xxii. 4; xxxiii. 17–26. [3] xxiii. 4.
[4] xliii. 7; xlv. 8; xlvi. 16–18. [5] xvii. 22–24.

forever.[1] But what precedes shows in what sense these declarations must be understood. David is here evidently taken collectively, or rather, the family of David is individualized in its head and called servant of Jehovah, as the entire people Israel is individualized and designated by this title not only in deutero-Isaiah, as we shall see later, but also in Jeremiah and Ezekiel.[2] Thus also prophetism is individualized, Deut. xviii. 15, 18, and the house of David, 1 Kings xii. 16.

The author of Zech. xii.–xiv. shares the idea of the preceding prophets. He speaks simply of the house of David, which, in the new era, will be powerful as the Deity, as the angel of Jehovah, while the feeblest Israelite will be a hero like David.[3]

Isaiah also seems to share this view. He speaks of princes who will govern the new people of God.[4] He employs the same comparison that we have found in Ezekiel, that of a branch that will spring from the stump of Jesse, of a shoot that will grow from his roots, to govern and judge this people.[5] Is this not the collective idea of the new Davidic dynasty? In chapter ix. verse 7, the prophet in fact speaks of the throne of David and of his kingdom which are to be established and maintained by justice and righteousness. In the verse preceding, however, there is reference to a child, newly born, on whose shoulder the government is to rest. Micah also says that from Bethlehem shall go forth he who will rule over Israel.[6] Finally, Zech. ix.

[1] Jer. xxx. 9; Ezek. xxxiv. 23 f.; xxxvii. 24 f.; comp. Hos. iii. 5.
[2] Jer. xxx. 10; xlvi. 27 f.; Ezek. xxviii. 25; xxxvii. 25.
[3] xii. 8. [4] xxxii. 1. [5] xi. 1 ff. [6] v. 2 ff.

9 f. speaks of the king who will come to Jerusalem and establish his reign from one sea to the other.

Did these prophets think that one and the same king would always govern the Messianic kingdom? In that case they would disagree with the prophets to whom reference was made above, which would prove at least that in Israel the expectation of a unique and eternal Messiah was not a dogma. But it is more probable that there was not on this subject any divergence of opinion among the prophets but that all expected the restoration of the dynasty of David, which was to be maintained forever by a perpetual descent; for this is the general expectation of Israel.[1]

If there is in some passages reference to only one king, it is because the prophets thought that there would never be more than one king at a time on the throne, and further because their attention was naturally fixed upon the first, the one who was to inaugurate the Messianic kingdom; this is certainly the case in the passages cited above, Zech. ix., Isa. ix., and Mic. v. Haggai thought that Zerubbabel, who had returned to Judah at the head of the first exiles, would be the king of the restored people, and that in him would be fulfilled the early Messianic prophecies.[2] Zechariah appears to have had the same thought. He foretells the coming of a man, a servant of Jehovah, called Sprout, who will build the temple of Jehovah, who will wear the insignia of royalty and rule upon his throne.[3] Now according to iv. 9 it is Zerubbabel

[1] 1 Kings ii. 4; viii. 25; ix. 4 f.; Ps. lxxxix. 3 f., 29–37; cxxxii. 10–12.

[2] ii. 21–23.

[3] iii. 9; vi. 12 f.; comp. Jer. xxiii. 5; xxxiii. 15.

who laid the foundation, and who will finish the temple. Zechariah had, in general, great hopes of this chief of the Jewish people.[1] But these prophets surely did not believe Zerubbabel immortal; they did not therefore expect an eternal Messiah, they simply placed Zerubbabel at the head of the royal line of Israel.

The Messiah, — we will preserve this hallowed title, even while giving it a collective sense, — is to be essentially a king, *i.e.* to possess and exercise sovereignty in every acceptation of the term. Even in Hos. iii. 5 and Zech. ix. 9 he is called a king; also in other passages that we have cited. Executive, and, since these also were exercised by the ancient kings of Israel, judicial, functions are attributed to him.[2] He will be surrounded by great glory.[3] He will secure peace to his extended realm;[4] but this will be by means of war successfully waged, by which also all the enemies of Israel will be annihilated.[5]

According to Ezekiel, the most Levitical of the prophets, an important duty of the king under the new covenant will be to furnish the numerous victims for the sacrifices of the feasts and other solemnities.[6] He will offer sacrifices for himself.[7] This single feature shows that the prophets had ideas of the Messiah that square perfectly with the view of the Old Testament, but differ so much the more from the teaching of the gospel.

[1] Zech. iv. 6 f.

[2] Zech. ix. 10; Isa. ix. 6; xi. 3 f.; Mic. v. 2, 4; Jer. xxiii. 5; xxx. 21; xxxiii. 15; Ezek. xxi. 32.

[3] Isa. xi. 10.

[4] Zech. ix. 10; Isa. ix. 6 f.; Mic. v. 5.

[5] Zech. ix. 13 ff.; xii. 1 ff.; Isa. xi., xiv.; Mic. v. 5–9.

[6] xlv. 17, 22 ff.

[7] xlvi. 2 ff.

The character and qualifications of the Messiah should correspond with his functions. Being called to govern an ideal kingdom, in which all the imperfections of this world will have disappeared, he should himself have an ideal character, and possess extraordinary qualifications. But we should do violence to the teaching of the Old Testament, if we tried to find in it the doctrine of the divinity of the Messiah for the purpose of making it conform to the Christian dogma of the divinity of Christ. Zechariah distinctly represents the Messiah as a man.[1] Micah says that Jehovah is his God.[2] We have seen that in a number of passages he is called servant of Jehovah. We know that, sprung from the family of David, he will perpetuate his stock in a natural way. He is everywhere, as respects his nature, placed on the same level as the other Israelites of the Messianic kingdom. Isaiah, who gives him the most sublime titles, says distinctly that the great qualifications with which he will be clothed will be communicated to him by the spirit of Jehovah,[3] which, we have seen, is promised to all Israel. Thus the Messiah will have all the intellectual, moral, and religious qualifications necessary for governing and judging his people.[4] Isaiah ix. 6 f. means nothing else, in spite of the extraordinary titles that we there encounter.

In this passage the Messiah is called Counsellor-prodigy, Wonderful Counsellor; this term denotes a qualification essential in a king who, like this one, is to procure for his people an exceptional degree of prosperity. He is called Hero-god, or, according to Brus-

[1] vi. 12. [2] v. 4. [3] xi. 2. [4] xi. 2–5.

ton, Valiant Warrior.[1] The title *El* does not authorize us to attribute to him a divine nature, since this same title is given to the king of Babylon.[2] We know that other kings and judges are called gods, without any intention of attributing to them a divine nature. The Messiah is called, according to some, Everlasting Father; according to others, Father of Booty. Both translations are grammatically possible (Reuss). If the second, which agrees very well with the title preceding, be adopted, it attributes to the Messiah victory over his enemies. The first represents him as the father of his people.[3] If eternity is attributed to him this "means that he will effect something everlasting; cause his kingdom and his dynasty to be everlasting."[4] Finally he is called Prince of Peace, not because he will not make war, but because, as a valiant hero, he will obtain victory over all his enemies, and thus give "increase to the empire, and a peace without end to the throne of David and his kingdom," as the passage in question says.

Micah represents the Messiah especially as a glorious king who will govern with the support of Jehovah, and render his people happy, procuring them peace by victory over his enemies, and particularly over the Assyrians, so formidable to Israel in the time of the prophet.[5] Attempts have been made to find the eternal preëxistence of the Messiah in the declaration of Micah that "his origin dates from ancient times, from the days of eternity." But this latter expression is explained by

[1] *Litérature Prophétique*, p. 141; [G. A. Smith, *Book of Isaiah*, pp. 136 ff.]. [2] Ezek. xxxi. 11. [3] Isa. xxii. 21.
[4] Bruston, p. 142; [Schultz, II. p. 403]. [5] v. 4 ff.

the parallel expression "from ancient times." The prophet simply means that the Messiah will be a descendant of the ancient family of David.[1] The word *eternity* or *eternal* has a merely relative signification in the language of the Old Testament.

The passage, Zech. xii. 8, which says that the house of David will be like the Deity, makes a simple comparison, meaning that the royal house, at the head of the Israelites, who will all be heroes, will be as it were a divine power, repelling the enemy. Finally the attempt has been made to find the divinity of the Messiah in Jer. xxiii. 6, where he is called "Jehovah our righteousness." But Oehler himself opposes this interpretation.[2] He shows that it is said, not that the Messiah will be Jehovah our righteousness, but that he is simply called by this name; that Jerusalem receives the same title,[3] and that an altar is called "Jehovah my standard."[4] It might be added that there are many Israelitish proper names, of which the name of God forms a part, yet those who bore them are not believed to have been partakers of divinity. It may even be that the name in question was not applied to the Messiah at all, but to Israel.[5]

## § 24. THE SERVANT OF JEHOVAH.

During the captivity in Babylon, when the royal house had fallen with the Israelitish nationality, deutero-Isaiah based the hope of the Messianic king-

[1] Bruston, p. 256; [Schultz, II. pp. 415 f.]. [2] § 231.
[3] Jer. xxxiii. 16. [4] Ex. xvii. 15.
[5] Schultz, II. p. 418; Reuss on Jer. xxiii. 6.

dom no longer on a descendant of David, a glorious and triumphant king, but upon the faithful and unhappy portion of the people to which he gives the name servant of Jehovah. He speaks of them more particularly in the following passages: xli. 8 ff.; xlii. 1–7, 18 ff.; xliii. 1–10; xliv. 1 f., 21–26; xlv.4; xlviii. 20; xlix. 1–9; l. 4–10; lii. 13 – liii. 12.

Traditional theology has seen in the servant of Jehovah the Messiah, and has regarded the passages that speak of him as predictions relating to Jesus Christ. What is true is that Jesus fulfilled the most sublime predictions that relate to the servant of Jehovah. But modern historical interpretation has had no difficulty in demonstrating that our prophet says not a single word about the Messiah; that he assigns to the servant of Jehovah a character and rôle entirely different from those that are attributed to the latter; that he regards him as existing in the present, as having suffered in the past, and as having a mission to fulfil among the exiled people; that finally he identifies the coming of the Messianic kingdom with the return from the Exile, and represents it after a manner in many respects entirely different from that of the gospel.

All this is supported by evidence that any one who does not insist upon shutting his eyes to it must consider unanswerable. It was easy enough to make this result clear. It was more difficult to say who, to the thought of the prophet, the servant of Jehovah really was. To this question modern exegetes give very divergent responses. Some have seen in the servant of Jehovah the people Israel taken in their concrete reality; others, the ideal people; still others, prophetism.

These divergencies are readily explained. Deutero-Isaiah actually gives the title servant of Jehovah to the people Israel taken in their historical reality, the blind, sinful, captive people.[1] In so doing he only adopts the language used in Jeremiah and Ezekiel.[2] But while these last two prophets, like the majority of their predecessors, condemn Israel in the mass, and accuse them of being completely corrupt, the first distinguishes two parts among the people, the one faithful, the other unfaithful. He knows righteous and faithful Israelites, he knows a great multitude who have the law of God in their hearts, who follow the right way and shun evil.[3] These righteous he carefully distinguishes from the unfaithful part of the people; he even contrasts them with the latter; in the second part of our book he calls them the servants of Jehovah in contrast with the wicked.[4] As far as chapter liii., on the contrary, this faithful part of the people, like the entire nation, is frequently called the servant of Jehovah.[5] This alone, in fact, formed the true Israel, and was really the servant of Jehovah, while the whole of Israel could receive this title only in a potential sense, inasmuch as its vocation was to serve God.

It is, therefore, wrong to claim, as has been done, that deutero-Isaiah gives the title servant of Jehovah exclusively either to the entire people Israel or to the faithful fraction of the people. The truth is that he gives it by turns to both of them. He presents this

[1] xli. 8 ff.; xlii. 19 ff.; xliv. 1 ff., 21 f.; xlv. 4; xlviii. 20.

[2] Jer. xxx. 10 ff.; xlvi. 27 f.; Ezek. xxviii. 25; xxxvii. 25; comp. Ps. cxxxvi. 22.

[3] li. 1, 7; lvii. 1 f.; lix. 15. [4] liv. 17; lxiii. 17; lxv. 1–lxvi. 14.

[5] xlii. 1–7; xliii. 10; xliv. 26; xlix. 1–9; l. 4–10; lii. 13–liii. 12.

fraction in an ideal light, but it has for him a real existence, so that it is equally wrong to hold that the servant of Jehovah is only an ideal people, as opposed to the real people. Finally, since the faithful portion of the people possesses certain characteristics and fulfils in part the mission of the prophets, the servants of God *par excellence*, it has been possible to maintain with some show of reason that the servant of Jehovah is Israelitish prophetism; but this is only apparently the case.

Our prophet, to whom the return from the Exile and the restoration of Israel are equivalent to the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom and universal salvation, thinks that the servant of Jehovah will contribute to this grand end, by bringing the captives forth from prison,[1] by bringing back the remnant of Israel, by raising up the tribes of Jacob, and by distributing among them the desolate heritages.[2] He will contribute to the work of restoration above all by producing among the people the disposition required, that God may grant them forgiveness and salvation. This prophet, in fact, like the others, insists that it is necessary for the people to turn to God, and practise righteousness, in order that God may be able to forgive them, make a new and everlasting covenant with them, and bestow upon them his blessings.[3] The chief office of the servant of Jehovah is to serve as mediator between Israel and their God in establishing this covenant.[4] For the old covenant has been broken through the sin of Israel, who are like a

[1] xlii. 7; xlix. 9. [2] xlix. 6, 8.
[3] xliv. 22; lv. 1 ff., 6 ff.; lvi. 1 f.; lviii. 1 ff.; lix. 20.
[4] xlii. 6; xlix. 8.

woman divorced by her husband.[1] Jehovah, in his great mercy, is ready to make a new covenant of peace with his rejected spouse.[2] But she must be equally disposed thereto. It is the office of the servant of Jehovah to open the eyes of the blind people,[3] to bring them back to God, from whom they have departed;[4] it is his office also to stimulate the courage of those who are not rebellious but downcast.[5]

That he may fulfil this mission God has clothed him with his spirit;[6] he has given him a ready tongue; he has waked him every morning, and opened his ear that he may docilely hear the divine instructions.[7] He has made his mouth like a sharp sword, and he has made him a sharpened arrow.[8] Thus prepared the servant of Jehovah fulfils his ministry with docility,[9] with gentleness and perseverance,[10] and yet this ministry is not an easy matter; it seems to produce no effect.[11] The servant of Jehovah is despised by his people, he is even an object of abhorrence to them.[12] He endures persecutions the most ignominious; but he bears them patiently, relying on the assistance of God, and assured that his enemies are on the way to destruction.[13] He knows that God will glorify himself in him;[14] he knows that he is honored in the eyes of Jehovah, and that his God is his strength,[15] that kings will rise before him and princes prostrate themselves at his feet.[16] This extraordinary humiliation of the servant of Jehovah and his glorious exaltation, so unexpected that it will fill

[1] l. 1; lix. 2. [2] liv. 1–10. [3] xlii. 7, 18 ff. [4] xlix. 5.
[5] xlii. 3; l. 4. [6] xlii. 1. [7] l. 4 f. [8] xlix. 2.
[9] l. 5. [10] xlii. 3 f. [11] xlix. 4. [12] xlix. 7.
[13] l. 6–9. [14] xlix. 3. [15] xlix. 5. [16] xlix. 7.

kings with astonishment, are also described in lii. 13–15, *i.e.* the beginning of the most original passage bearing on our subject, which, however, has been very variously interpreted.[1]

The prophet, after having indicated the general subject that he is going to treat, — the extreme humiliation and the extraordinary exaltation of the servant of Jehovah, — complains that such preaching has generally met with unbelief among his people.[2] Then the Israelites, guilty but repentant, are represented as speaking. They first testify to the wretched condition of the servant of Jehovah: he is like a weak plant, a wretched shoot, that springs from a parched soil,[3] or like a man sick with a horrible disease.[4] It will be easy to understand what has just been said, and what is said a little later,[5] if we do not lose sight of the passages already cited, and others in which appears the express declaration that the faithful portion of Israel endure contempt, abuse, persecution, such as no one else has to endure,[6] and that though the righteous perish, no one lays it to heart.[7] But what is new is that the guilty Israelites recognize that the servant of Jehovah has borne their sufferings, that he has been wounded for their sins, and smitten for their iniquity, and that the punishment that has overtaken him procures them peace and salvation.[8] The prophet, speaking in his turn, beginning with verse 7, confirms the conviction of the guilty people; he, too, declares that the servant of Jehovah has been smitten for the sins of his people, that it has pleased God to crush him with suffering in

[1] lii. 13–liii. 12. [2] liii. 1. [3] liii. 2. [4] liii. 3.
[5] liii. 7. [6] xlix. 7; l. 6 ff.; li. 7. [7] lvii. 1. [8] liii. 4–6.

spite of his innocence, that he has surrendered his life as a sacrifice for sin.[1] These sufferings, willingly accepted, and innocently endured, redound to the prosperity of the work of God in the hands of his servant.[2] With this work we are already acquainted. But it is once again described; it consists in henceforth making men righteous by instruction, and bearing their iniquities.[3] Indeed, if the servant of Jehovah was clothed with the divine spirit and instructed by God, that he might fulfil his high mission,[4] his seed will enjoy the same privilege; the spirit of God will rest on them, and his words will ever be in their mouths,[5] evidently in view of the mission that will hereafter devolve upon the true Israel. But the sufferings of the servant of Jehovah will bring the sufferer to glory; he will see a posterity, and prolong his days; freed from troubles of soul, he will feast his eyes on the success of his work; God will give him his part with the great, he will share the booty with the strong.[6] These last words and the parallel passages in our book[7] show clearly that even in this remarkable chapter, in which one at times believes one's self on evangelical ground, the view of the Old Testament is maintained, and that here also the servant of Jehovah is a collective term for faithful Israel, who, after having innocently endured many sufferings, and thus contributed to the salvation, the deliverance, of their people, will enjoy the extraordinary glory, greatness, and prosperity of the same.

The above result finds its partial confirmation and explanation in chapter lxv. *vv.* 8–10. Here, indeed,

[1] liii. 8–10. [2] liii. 10. [3] liii. 11. [4] xlii. 1; xlix. 2; l. 4 f.
[5] lix. 21. [6] liii. 10–12. [7] xlix. 7; lii. 15.

Israel is compared to a cluster of grapes, which is not to be destroyed on account of the juice that it contains. "I will do thus," says Jehovah, "for the sake of my servants, in order that all may not be destroyed. I will cause my posterity to come forth from Jacob, and from Judah an heir to my mountains; my chosen shall possess the country, and my servants dwell in it. Sharon shall serve as pasture for the flocks, and the valley of Achor as an abode for the herds, for my people who shall have sought me." Thus the faithfulness of a portion of Israel will prevent God from destroying the entire nation. The gross sinners, the idolaters, the impenitent, will doubtless be exterminated.[1] But those who seek God, after having confessed their faults will be saved for the sake of the faithful portion of Israel, and with them. And salvation will consist in the possession of the country and great material prosperity.

We have seen that the servant of Jehovah fulfils his mission, in part at least, by his sufferings, by becoming an expiatory victim, both in the eyes of the people and in the eyes of God. He gives to the offended God the satisfaction that is due him, and procures for the guilty and repentant people assurance of the forgiveness of God. Hence the establishment of a new covenant between Israel and their God becomes possible, and in consequence of this covenant of peace and salvation, the deliverance and restoration of Israel also. It should be observed that the prophet gives the promise of the covenant immediately after having shown in chapter liii. that the sins of the people have been expi-

[1] lxv. 11 ff.; comp. *vv.* 5–7; lxvi. 4–6, 14, 17, 24; l. 11.

ated.[1] To the thought of the prophet there was evidently a real connection between these two ideas.

How did deutero-Isaiah attain this original idea, that the faithful part of Israel atones for the sins of the unfaithful portion? It meets, in reality, a want that must have made itself keenly felt in the land of exile. It was not possible to offer to Jehovah victims to appease him, and to obtain his forgiveness there, far from the only lawful sanctuary. How then was assurance of his forgiveness to be obtained? This was possible if the faithful part of Israel was regarded as an expiatory victim. Now this conception would naturally enough present itself to the mind of the prophet. It was always believed in Israel that faults could be expiated by persons other than those who committed them. Thus the family of Korah, and that of Achan had to expiate the faults committed by their heads;[2] the people Israel had to suffer for the faults of King David[3] and King Manasseh;[4] and the descendants of Saul for that of their ancestor.[5] We have already seen that, as a rule, the Israelites believed that the merit and the demerit of one person or generation could be imputed to another, and those of one part of the community to the entire community.

## § 25. RETRIBUTION AND THEODICY.

It clearly follows from the above, and from a consideration of all the documents of the first two periods, that the Israelites believed only in an earthly retri-

[1] liv. 1–10. [2] Num. xvi. 25 ff.; Josh. 7. [3] 2 Sam. xxiv.
[4] 2 Kings xxiii. 26; xxiv. 3 f.; Jer. xv. 4. [5] 2 Sam. xxi. 1–14.

bution for human actions. There is not, in the writings of the prophets, where the punishment of sin on the one hand and the hope of future salvation on the other, play so great a part, the least trace of the idea that sin can be punished and virtue rewarded in another life. According to the general opinion of the Hebrews God rewards good and punishes evil in this world; all misfortune is a divine penalty, incurred by unfaithfulness, and all blessing a divine reward, merited by faithfulness; in a word, there is an exact ratio between misfortune and guilt, between happiness and merit.

For a long time these conceptions seem to have aroused no serious opposition; for there is none to be met in the oldest documents. But in proportion as the events of individual life and of history were more clearly observed, and more thoughtfully studied, it was perceived that experience constantly contradicted this theory of retribution, that many who were wicked were happy, and many who were righteous were unhappy. Hence arose great perplexity for the one who did not close his eyes to evidence, a snare that might cause believers to stumble, and throw them into doubt.[1] This difficulty made itself felt especially from the Exile onward.[2] From that time also the most serious efforts were made to overcome it.

Perhaps the difficulty had been perceived at an earlier date, and the attempt had been made to relieve it by saying that God visits the faults of fathers upon their

[1] Comp. Isa. v. 18–20.

[2] Jer. xii. 1 ff.; xviii. 20; xx. 18; Hab. i. 2 ff., 13 ff.; Ezek. xviii. 25, 29; xxxiii. 17, 20; Isa. xl. 27; lviii. 3; Mal. iii. 13 ff.; Ps. x. 1 ff.; xxxv. 17 ff.; xliv. 17–26; lxxiii. 1–14; xciv. 1 ff.

children, and that he rewards children for the faithfulness of their ancestors.[1] It must be admitted that this principle finds support in the laws of solidarity and heredity observed in the experience of every day: children do often suffer for the faults of their parents, or profit by their virtues. This principle is especially true when it is applied to an entire people considered collectively, as for example, the people Israel, since succeeding generations generally suffer for the faults of those preceding.

But this comparatively early opinion also aroused objections, and gave occasion for the sarcastic proverb, "the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the sons' teeth have been set on edge."[2] It was opposed by the thought that each bore the penalty of his own sin.[3] Thus the traditional standpoint was maintained, and an explanation that at least relieved the difficulty raised by it, discarded. But how was this difficulty from that time forward to be solved? It was taught that man has no right to contend with God, the creature with the creator, the work with him who made it;[4] it was asserted that man, far from being righteous, is in reality guilty;[5] or perhaps it was maintained that the happiness of the wicked is only fleeting, and always comes to an unhappy end, while the misfortune of the righteous can only be temporary;[6] in some passages

[1] Ex. xx. 5 f.; Deut. v. 9 f.; comp. Hos. iv. 6; Jer. xxxii. 18.

[2] Jer. xxxi. 29; Ezek. xviii. 2.

[3] Jer. xxxi. 30; Ezek. xviii. 3 ff.; xxxiii. 10-20; Deut. xxiv. 16; 2 Kings xiv. 6.

[4] Isa. xxix. 16; xlv. 9 f.; Jer. xviii. 6.

[5] Ezek. xviii. 29 ff.; xxxiii. 17 ff.; Isa. lviii. 3 ff.

[6] Ps. lxxiii. 16–24; ix. 17 f.; xxxvii.; xlix.; lv. 22 f.; lxiv.; xciv. 8-23; Prov. xxiii. 17 f.

there appears even the higher idea that misfortune has a salutary effect upon man, like that of correction upon the child;[1] finally, in deutero-Isaiah, occurs the thought that the righteous may be called to suffer for the guilty, and thus save these latter from merited chastisements.[2] It may well be that the explanation of chapter liii. of Isaiah should be sought in part in the preconceptions to which the question of retribution gave rise at the time of the Exile. Have we not in this chapter a new solution of the problem? The faithful portion of Israel suffered innocently: how are these sufferings to be explained from the Israelitish standpoint, according to which misfortune and sin, happiness and righteousness, always balance each other? They are explained on the supposition that the faithful portion of Israel expiate the sins of the unfaithful.

The problem of which we are speaking engrossed and perplexed Israelitish thinkers to such a degree that one of them felt the need of giving it thorough treatment, and making it the subject of an entire book, — that of Job. The following is a rough outline of the contents in their connection of this theodicy of the Old Testament. Righteous Job is overtaken by great misfortunes though he has not deserved them, solely that his piety may be tested.[3] Here, therefore, is experience, in the person of Job, protesting against the old theory of retribution. In the long conversations that take place between him and his friends, Job gives utterance to doubts concerning Providence, because he sees himself unjustly and severely punished. The three

[1] Prov. iii. 11 f. ; Deut. viii. 2–5 ; Lam. iii. 27–30.
[2] Isa. liii.
[3] Chaps. i. f.

friends dispute this claim, and seek to convince Job that he has deserved these misfortunes by which he is smitten, thus maintaining the traditional opinion concerning retribution. But he, sure of his innocence, defends it tenaciously, and successfully repels all the objections of his friends.[1] Elihu, a fourth friend, who has thus far remained silent, now takes up the discussion.[2] He also declares that Job is not perfectly innocent, and reproaches him with his doubts concerning divine Providence, "who rendereth to man according to his works, and causeth him to find according to his ways."[3] On this point he shares the traditional opinion defended by the other three friends. But the new features in his discourse are his representation of afflictions as a means of trying and correcting man,[4] and his contention that God is much too great for a feeble mortal to be able to comprehend his ways.[5] This latter point is taken up and developed more at length by God himself, who replies to Job from the midst of the tempest, and calls his attention to the wonders of nature.[6] Finally Job confesses that he does not at all understand the works of God, and admits that man must humbly submit to the incomprehensible purposes of the Almighty.[7] In the epilogue[8] God declares that the first three friends have spoken less worthily of him than Job, evidently because they have maintained the old theory of retribution, opposed by the latter.

It is clear that the object of the book of Job is to refute this theory. It shows that the righteous man

[1] Chaps. iii.–xxxi. [2] Chaps. xxxii. ff. [3] xxxiv. 5 ff.; xxxv. 1 ff.
[4] xxxiii. 14-30; xxxvi. 7–15. [5] xxxvi. 22–xxxvii. 24.
[6] Chaps. xxxviii.–xli. [7] xlii. 1–6. [8] xlii. 7 ff.

may also be overtaken by great ills, since they are not necessarily merited penalties, but may be simply a means of testing his piety, as the prologue asserts of the afflictions of Job. The book further means to assert that it is rash in man to contend with God and wish to understand his ways, that the highest human wisdom consists in fearing God and fleeing evil.[1] Finally, according to the epilogue, the man who remains faithful to God, even in the midst of trial, will again be delivered and blessed with peculiar favor.[2] The discourses of Elihu, which, according to many critics, originally formed no part of the book, add the idea that afflictions are salutary for man, because they help to rid him of his faults, and save him from the penalties that these faults would bring upon him. Oehler says of the book of Job that it presents at the same time all the problems that ever engaged the minds of wise Israelites, and all the solutions of them that they proposed.[3] This is true at all events of problems of theodicy and retribution. All the solutions that it proposes on this subject are, in fact, found in other isolated passages which have been cited.

Submission and resignation, even when one does not comprehend the ways of God, — such is the last word of Israelitish wisdom, respecting the important problem under discussion. But to submit without hope, to submit without the hope of ever comprehending, of one day seeing fall the veil that hides the ways of divine Providence, — this cannot satisfy the human mind and heart. We feel the need of knowing the object of life and of the world, the need of knowing that God does everything for the best.

[1] xxviii. 28. [2] xlii. 10–17. [3] § 247.

The book of Job shows clearly that, on the prime question of life, the view of Israelitish wisdom and prophetism is unsatisfactory, and that it must be supplemented by a loftier view, by the evangelical view, which opens the prospect of an eternal life and retribution. The thought of the future life, and the consolation that flows from it in misfortune, presented itself, indeed, to the mind of our author.[1] But he did not dare dwell on it. It appeared to him as a pious desire, and not as a well grounded hope.

[1] xiv. 14.

# THIRD PERIOD.

## § 26. HOLY SCRIPTURE.

We have seen that, in the first period, traditional ideas and usages exercised a preponderating influence, and that in the second, prophetism sought to obtain such an influence by opposing the idolatrous or superstitious errors and usages of the past; in the third period we see formed a collection of sacred books, which henceforward constitutes the supreme authority in matters of faith, the fundamental basis of the religious, moral, and even national life of the *Jews*, as the remnants of the ancient people Israel are called after the Exile.

The first reference to sacred writings is in document A, which tells us of two tables of stone containing the decalogue,[1] and a book of the covenant containing the words, the statutes, of Jehovah, written by Moses.[2] But these references have not a well established historical character, and we find no certain traces of a part played and an influence exerted by these documents. The prophets, who always preach in the name of Jehovah, never appeal to a written law even when they employ the term *torah*, which is ordinarily translated *law*, but which denotes rather prophetic or other oral teach-

[1] Ex. xxiv. 12; xxxi. 18; xxxii. 15 f.; xxxiv. 1, 4, 28.
[2] Ex. xxiv. 4, 7.

ing.[1] A single passage, Hos. viii. 12, where there is probably an allusion to the passages cited from document A, mentions the statutes of the law of Jehovah written by himself.

We find no historical trace of a second book until toward the Exile. We learn from 2 Kings xxii. f. that, in the eighteenth year of the reign of Josiah, there was discovered in the temple, where it was the practice to deposit writings of an official character,[2] a book of the law and the covenant, which was certainly the legal and more important part of Deuteronomy. As soon as the king had made himself acquainted with the contents of this book he caused it to be read to all the people. We see from the account that has been preserved to us that no such thing had ever before been done, that it was new to every one. It is this book to which reference is made, 1 Kings ii. 3; 2 Kings xiv. 6 and xxi. 8. It is not probable that from this time forth the law was regularly read before the people, for if it had been we could not comprehend the profound ignorance of it, and the flagrant transgressions against it that show themselves in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, among all the Jews, even the chief of them.[3]

Ezra probably contributed most to the formation of the Pentateuch, which in the Hebrew Bible bears the title *Law*, and he seems to have given the first impulse to a regular reading of this portion of Scripture. He is represented to us as a scribe versed in the law, diligent in studying it, in putting it into practice, and in teach-

[1] Reuss, *Gesch.*, § 261 ; [W. R. Smith, *Old Test.*, pp. 292 ff.].

[2] 1 Sam. x. 25 ; Deut. xxxi. 26.

[3] Ezra ix. 1 f. ; x. 18 ; Neh. v. 1–5 ; viii. 13 ; xiii. 4–31.

ing it to the people.[1] He trained other teachers of the law that they might be able to explain it.[2] He caused the priests, the Levites, and the leaders of the people to solemnly swear that the law should be observed.[3] He made them sign a written covenant, based on this promise, after having read and explained to them the contents of the law.[4] According to this we may suppose that Ezra was the promoter of public and regular readings of the law;[5] it was, moreover, the only means of making it known to all, in accordance with certain directions of Deuteronomy,[6] and an injunction of the last prophet, a contemporary of Ezra and Nehemiah.[7] At that time it was not possible for the great majority of private individuals to own a copy of the law. We find here, further, the starting point for the worship of the synagogues, which consisted chiefly in the reading and explanation of the law. In the apostolic age a synagogue existed wherever there was a Jewish community of any size, and the practice of reading Moses every Sabbath was very ancient.[8]

From the time of Ezra onward, *i.e.* after the middle of the fifth century before our era, the law of Moses,[9] or the law of Jehovah,[10] which henceforth or soon afterwards we find identified with the Pentateuch, was the supreme authority in matters of faith: it is styled holy and reverend;[11] an infinite value is attributed to it, for it is regarded as the source of life;[12] it is called the incor-

[1] Ezra vii. 6, 10 f., 21. [2] Neh. viii. 13, 7–9. [3] Ezra x. 3–5.
[4] Neh. viii. – x. [5] Neh. xiii. 1.
[6] vi. 6 f. ; xi. 18–20 ; xxxi. 9–13. [7] Mal. iv. 4.
[8] Acts xv. 21 ; comp. 2 Cor. iii. 15.
[9] Ezra iii. 2 ; vi. 18 ; Neh. viii. 1. [10] Ezra vii. 10.
[11] 2 Macc. vi. 23, 28. [12] Bar. iv. 1 ; Tob. i. 6.

ruptible light;[1] it is believed to be able to communicate supreme wisdom;[2] its regulations are observed in the most scrupulous manner;[3] death is preferred to transgression against it;[4] private individuals even possess copies of it;[5] great attachment to it is displayed, the idea being that this is the most sacred duty that can be performed.[6] The greatest favor that the conquerors of Palestine can grant the Jews is permission to live according to the regulations of the law;[7] and it is the prohibition of the observance of the law, and the decree that it be transgressed, which rouse the Jews against their oppressors in the days of the Maccabees. Later, in the midst of Judaism, it is all regarded as a direct revelation from God. It is declared that he who claims that it did not come from heaven, will have no part in the world to come; that he who says that Moses added a single word of his own knowledge, denies and despises the word of God.[8]

To this first and oldest collection of the Hebrew Bible, the Law, was afterward attached a second, *the Prophets*, which was divided into the former and the latter prophets. The former include the historical books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings; the latter, the prophetical books properly so called., *i.e.* all the books that we call prophetical, excepting Daniel.

[1] Wis. xviii. 4. [2] Sir. xxiv. 23–29; xxxix. 1 ff.; Bar. iii. 12.

[3] Ezra iii. 2; vii. 10, 23; x. 3; Neh. viii. 14 ff.; x. 29; xii. 44; xiii. 3; 1 Macc. iii. 56; iv. 47; 2 Macc. iii. 1; vi. 23.

[4] 1 Macc. i. 56 ff.; ii. 29 ff.; 2 Macc. vii. [5] 1 Macc. i. 57.

[6] 1 Macc. ii. 19–22, 26–28, 46–48; iii. 21; iv. 42; vi. 59; xiii. 3; xiv. 29; 2 Macc. xiii. 10 f.; Ps. cxix. [7] 1 Macc. vi. 59; x. 37.

[8] Schürer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Div. II. Vol. I. p. 307.

The latest prophets begin to allude to the preaching of the earliest.[1] When in still later times prophets ceased to arise among the Jews, to the great grief of the people,[2] there was felt the need of collecting the extant prophetical writings, that it might be possible to consult the teaching contained in them, and to possess the complete word of God, which was early divided in law and prophets.[3] According to 2 Macc. ii. 13, the formation of a collection of prophetical books dates from Nehemiah, and it seems to follow, from Sir. xliv. – xlix., that when this book was written, at the beginning of the second century before our era, the first two, and the principal, parts of the Hebrew Bible, above mentioned, already existed. The collection of the prophets, it is true, did not at once enjoy the same authority, and never played the same part among the Jews as the law. Yet as early as about 130 before our era, the translator of Sirach, in his preface, places the law and the prophets upon the same level, and shows that the author, his grandfather, was acquainted with other books of the fathers besides these two collections.

These last also doubtless had a sacred character, and probably at its formation became parts of the third collection of the Hebrew Bible, which bears the title *Scriptures*, a word which among the church fathers is rendered *Hagiographa*, *i.e.* sacred Scriptures. We need not dwell longer on this third collection, which, even in the apostolic age, does not seem to have become part of the canon, at least in its whole extent. In the

[1] Ezek. xxxviii. 17; Zech. i. 4; vii. 7, 12.
[2] 1 Macc. iv. 46; ix. 27; xiv. 41; Ps. lxxiv. 9.
[3] Zech. vii. 12; Neh. ix. 26.

New Testament, Scripture is simply called "the law and the prophets," or "Moses and the prophets."[1] Once only mention is made of the Psalms along with the law of Moses and the prophets.[2]

The letter of Scripture then, among the Jews, was the supreme authority in matters of faith, the source and norm of religious teaching, and even of civil law, which among them as among the early Israelites had an essentially religious and theocratic character. We find traces of the use that was made of Scripture for the instruction and edification of the faithful even in a number of psalms;[3] we find them especially in the Apocrypha.[4] Appeal was made to sacred texts as to a divine authority;[5] recourse was had to them as to the best source of consolation.[6]

The Jews, as we perceive, became "the men of one book." In the place of prophets they had scribes and doctors of the law, interpreters of the sacred code; biblical texts and exegesis, therefore, took the place of vital inspiration.

[1] Matt. v. 17; vii. 12; xi. 13; xxii. 40; Luke xvi. 16, 29, 31; xxiv. 27; John i. 46; Acts xxiv. 14; xxviii. 23; Rom. iii. 21.

[2] Luke xxiv. 44.

[3] lxxviii.; lxxxix.; xcv.; cv.; cvi.; cxiv.; cxxxii.; cxxxvi.

[4] Sir. xvi. 7 ff.; xvii. 1 ff.; xxxviii. 5; xl. 10; xliv.–xlix.; Wis. x.–xii.; xvi.–xix.; 1 Macc. ii. 52 ff.; iv. 9, 30; vii. 41; 2 Macc. vii. 6; viii. 19; xii. 15; xv. 9, 22; Judith v. 6 ff.

[5] 2 Chron. xvii. 9; xxiii. 18; xxv. 4; Ezra i. 1; iii. 2 ff.; vi. 18; Neh. viii. 1; Dan. ix. 2, 11; Bar. ii. 2, 20–24, 28 f.; Tob. i. 6; ii. 5 f.; viii. 5 f.; xiv. 4 f.; 1 Macc. vii. 16 ff.

[6] 1 Macc. xii. 9.

## § 27. THE DOCTRINE OF GOD.

The idea of God is in many respects the same among the Jews as among the Israelites, and the literature of the third period contains, with regard to it as with regard to so many other things, views that we have encountered in the oldest literature. It is doubtless useless for us to dwell on them a second time. It will suffice to notice anything new, characteristic, that this period has to offer.

First of all we must remark the decisive triumph of monotheism. Down to the Exile, idolatry was often practised by the people and even by their leaders; after the Exile, it completely and forever disappears from the midst of the Jewish nation. This is easy of comprehension. The Babylonian captivity was regarded as a just punishment for past unfaithfulnesses, and particularly of the greatest of all, idolatry. It was, moreover, the most zealous among the Jews, those most attached to the worship of Jehovah, who returned from the Exile, and in the beginning formed a little nucleus, clustered about Jerusalem, and having at its head a large proportion of priests. Many of the reforms that had previously been attempted in vain, under these circumstances and from this moment became possible. Now the fundamental reform was the decisive triumph, over all idolatry, of faith in the only true God, creator of heaven and earth, supreme ruler and preserver of the entire world.

A second point to emphasize, with respect to the Jews, is their speculative tendency. In the writings of the prophets, especially the older, all is spontaneous;

the pure expression of life, of an intense and profound religious faith. It is feeling and imagination that dominate in their discussions. It is the richness of religious and moral life that gives them their value. Among the Jewish people, on the contrary, and especially among their spiritual leaders, life and feeling are eclipsed by reflection, prophetism gives place to rabbinism, inspiration to speculation. The doctors who succeed the prophets strive much more after the possession and dissemination of correct conceptions of God than the cultivation of life in God; they undertake to elaborate a genuine doctrine of God, a complete system of theology, which the prophets never tried to do.

In the translation of the Seventy, and in the Targums or commentaries for which we are indebted to the old Jewish doctors, the sense of passages is often warped, for the sake of removing whatever was too offensive in the theophanies and anthropomorphisms of the Old Testament.[1] This tendency is particularly prominent in Philo and other Jewish thinkers of Alexandria, who were influenced by Greek philosophy.[2] But it is of much older date. We find the first traces of it in biblical literature. There also is seen a disposition to exalt God infinitely above all that is earthly, human, and imperfect, even above all human conception.[3] This extraordinary exaltation of the Deity is expressed by calling him God of the heavens,[4] or simply

[1] Nicolas, *Doctrines relig. des Juifs*, pp. 147 ff.; Stapfer, *Les idées relig. en Palestine*, 2d ed., pp. 31 ff.; [Toy, *Judaism and Christianity*, p. 87].

[2] Nicolas, pp. 161 ff.

[3] Eccl. iii. 14; v. 2; vii. 13; xi. 5; Sir. xlii. 21; xliii. 27 ff.

[4] Jon. i. 9; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 23; Ezra i. 2; v. 11 f.; vi. 10; vii. 12, 21, 23; Neh. i. 4 f.; ii. 4, 20; Eccl. v. 2; Dan. ii. 18 f., 37, 44; iv. 37; v. 23; Ps. cxxxvi. 26; etc.

Heaven,[1] or the Supreme, the Most-High, a name that occurs on every page of Sirach, but which we also frequently find elsewhere.[2]

From the idea that God is absolutely incomprehensible and infinitely exalted flows the other that man cannot enter into direct relations with him, that he can neither know nor tell what he is, that consequently he neither can nor ought to pronounce his name. Lev. xxiv. 16 says: "He who blasphemeth the name of Jehovah shall be punished with death." The Seventy, on the contrary, translate: "He who pronounceth the name of the Lord shall be punished with death." In accordance with this principle in the Hebrew Bible the vowel points of the divine name *Adhonay* Lord and, in certain cases those of the divine name *Elohim*, are given to the word *Yhwh* in order that the proper name of God may not be pronounced or profaned. Even in a number of canonical documents later than the Exile, like Chronicles, when they do not follow an older source, and in certain of the psalms, we find the abstract name *Elohim* preferred where, in the older documents, the name *Yahweh* is generally found.[3] In the first book of the Psalms,[4] which contains the oldest of these religious songs, the name *Elohim* appears only fifteen times and *Yahweh* 272 times; while in the second book[5] the name *Yahweh* occurs only thirty times and *Elohim* 164 times. Ecclesiastes uses only this latter name. The

[1] Dan. iv. 26; 1 Macc. iii. 60; iv. 10; Mark xi. 30; Luke xv. 18, 21.

[2] Eccl. v. 7; Dan. iv. 17, 24 f., 32, 34; v. 18, 21; vii. 18, 22, 25, 27; etc.

[3] 1 Chron. iv. 10; v. 20, 25; vi. 49; xii. 22; xiii. 12; xiv. 10, 14, 16; xv. 15; xvi. 1; etc.; comp. especially Ps. xiv. 2, 4 with liii. 2, 4, and xl. 13, 16 with lxx. 1, 4. [4] Ps. i.–xli. [5] Ps. xlii.–lxxiii.

later book of Daniel, except in the ninth chapter, also carefully avoids the use of the name *Yahweh*.

This idea that God is infinitely exalted above the world, and without direct relations with it, necessarily led to the recognition of intermediate beings through whom relations might be made possible. Thus arose the doctrine of the *logos*, the word which played so important a part first in Jewish and afterward in Christian theology. It took shape under the influence of Greek philosophy, which Philo and other Alexandrian Jews sought to reconcile with the biblical teaching.[1] But its roots reach into the Old Testament.

This doctrine, it is true, is not found wherever the attempt has been made to find it. Traditional theology, which claims that the doctrine of the trinity is taught throughout the Bible, has maintained that the spirit, the word, and the wisdom of God are, in a number of passages of the Old Testament, represented as hypostases or persons. For the spirit of God it finds its chief support in Gen. i. 2, where, at the time of creation, the spirit of God is said to have moved above the waters; then in Isa. xlviii. 16, where the prophet declares that Jehovah and his spirit have sent him; finally in Isa. lxiii. 10, where it is asserted that the rebellious Israelites grieved the holy spirit of God. Respecting the word of God, the most decisive passages that it has brought forward are Isa. lv. 11, which represents the word of God as executing his will and fulfilling his purposes; Ps. xxxiii. 6, which declares that the heavens were made by the word of Jehovah; Ps. cxlvii. 15, which says that the word of God runs

[1] Nicolas, pp. 178 ff.; Stapfer, pp. 39 ff.; [Toy, pp. 106 ff.].

swiftly. As for the wisdom of God, two passages have been preferred as citations: Job xxviii. 23 ff., where God seems to have met wisdom at the creation, and Prov. viii. 22 ff., where wisdom appears as the first creature taking part in the creation of all the rest, and giving joy to God.

It is evident that in these passages the spirit and the word of God are personified, but that these personifications must be placed on the same level with others of the same kind. Wisdom alone appears as a veritable hypostasis, not in the trinitarian sense, for in the passage from Proverbs she is represented as a creature of God, but more or less in the sense of the Jewish doctrine of the logos, which would harmonize better than the Christian doctrine of the trinity with Israelitish monotheism.

This doctrine, more developed, recurs in some apocryphal books. In the book of Baruch, and in that of Sirach, the wisdom of God does not as yet appear very clearly as an hypostasis; but in Wisdom doubt is no longer possible. In imitation of Job xxviii. 12 ff., the book of Baruch says that men generally have not known how to find wisdom,[1] but that God knows her;[2] that he has given her to Israel, that she has appeared on earth, and that she has remained among men;[3] that she has exercised her influence upon the law.[4] According to Sirach she is eternally with God.[5] She was created before all things else.[6] God created her, saw her, and shed her upon all his works.[7] After having left the mouth of the Most-High, and having sought in the whole uni-

[1] iii. 12–21. [2] iii. 32 ff. [3] iii. 36 f. [4] iv. 1.
[5] i. 1. [6] i. 4. [7] i. 9 f.

verse a place of rest, a stable abode, a field of activity, the creator of all things else, and also of wisdom, assigned to her as a peculiar abode the people Israel, among whom she rules, prospers, performs her work, officiating in the sanctuary, imbuing the law, imparting instruction as prophecy.[1] In other passages wisdom is personified in the same way as in the book of Proverbs; she is thought to direct the man who trusts in her and listens to her, that she may lead him to life, happiness, the best blessings.[2]

The praise of wisdom is the favorite theme of the book of Wisdom, in which it is constantly personified.[3] Chapter vii. is especially remarkable in this respect, because wisdom there, more clearly than anywhere else, appears as a hypostasis, as the universal artist endowed with the spirit and the most varied divine perfections.[4] She is an emanation from the glory of the Almighty, the splendor of eternal light, a stainless mirror of his activity, the image of his goodness.[5] She is one, and she can do all things; she remains the same, and she renews all things.[6] She stands in the closest relation to God, who loves her.[7] She sits at his side on the throne,[8] she is acquainted with all the works of God; for she was present when God created the world, and as supreme artist assisted in the creation of all things,[9] also in that of man.[10] She knows the past, and she foresees the future.[11] Her power extends from one

[1] xxiv.

[2] iv. 11 ff.; vi. 18 ff.; xi. 1; xiv. 20 ff.; xv. 2 ff.; li. 13 ff.; comp. Prov. i. 20 ff.; viii. 1 ff.; ix. 1 ff.

[3] i. 6; vi. 12 ff.; viii. 1 ff., 8 ff., 16 ff.; ix. 4, 9 ff.; x.; xi. 1.

[4] *vv.* 21–24. [5] *vv.* 25 f. [6] *vv.* 27, 23. [7] viii. 3. [8] ix. 4.

[9] ix. 9, 11; viii. 5 f.; vii. 21, 12. [10] ix. 2. [11] viii. 8.

end of the world to the other, and she governs wonderfully all things.[1] She is active in the moral world as well as the universe in general. From generation to generation she enters into holy souls, she makes them friends of God and prophets, she teaches them to recognize and fulfil the divine will, and she also procures them salvation.[2] She providentially controlled the history of the first men, and that of the people Israel.[3] It is God who sends her from his glorious seat.[4] Inasmuch as she performs her work in the physical and the moral world she is identified with the spirit of God[5] and the word of God,[6] both of whom here also appear as genuine hypostases.

We see that though the Israelites under the influence of prophetism did not engage in speculations that could serve as a starting point for the dogma of the trinity, it is possible to show that speculations of this kind flourished among the Jews in proportion as they felt the influence of Greek philosophy. Here then is where this famous dogma has its roots, and not in prophetic revelation.

## § 28. ANGELOLOGY.

The same reason that led the Jews to make the word and the wisdom of God genuine hypostases, intermediate beings, through whom the transcendent God communicates with men and acts upon the world, contributed also to the development of angelology. This was,

[1] vii. 12; viii. 1. [2] vii. 27, 23; ix. 1–19. [3] Chaps. x. – xii.
[4] ix. 10. [5] i. 4 ff.; ix. 17; xii. 1.
[6] ix. 1 f.; xvi. 12, 26; xviii. 15 ff.

however, only a popular belief without further importance. Before the Exile, in fact, there is seldom mention of angels among the prophets, the best accredited representatives of the religion of Israel. From the Exile onward, on the contrary, there arises a genuine angelology, which takes an important place in the Jewish religion, and appears even in some of the last prophets.

In these latter the angels play the entirely new part of mediators and interpreters of prophecy. They appear in this part in Ezekiel,[1] oftener still in Zechariah,[2] and especially in Daniel.[3] They play the same part in 1 Kings xiii. 18 and 1 Chron. xxi. 18. Formerly, on the contrary, God communicated his revelations directly to the prophets.

In the documents of Hebraism the angels appear as simple agents of the Deity, temporarily commissioned to make known or execute the will of God. They do not bear proper names to distinguish them from one another; they are not organized into a hierarchy; they all appear to be equal in dignity, and to derive their authority only from God. A single text, Josh. v. 13–15, designates an angel as the leader of the army of Jehovah. But it is impossible to infer from this passage any precise idea respecting a hierarchical organization of the angels. After the Exile it is different. Then the angels are organized as a hierarchy; they have leaders designated by proper names; they are classified into various divisions, each of which has

[1] ix. 2 ff.; xl. 3 ff.; xliii. 5 ff.

[2] i. 8 ff.; ii. 1 ff.; iii. 1 ff.; iv. 1 ff.; v. 5 ff.; vi. 4 ff.

[3] iv. 13, 23; vii. 16; viii. 13, 15 ff.; ix. 21 ff.; x. 5 ff., 15 ff.; xii. 5 ff.

special functions to fulfil, a particular department to govern.

In Ezekiel reference is made to seven angels who appear as the principal executors of the judgments of God.[1] These seven angels are perhaps the seven eyes of God of which Zechariah speaks,[2] and probably the leaders or princes of whom Daniel speaks.[3] The book of Tobit also speaks of seven principal angels who have peculiarly free access to the presence of God, and who present to him the prayers of the saints,[4] like the servants and the seven leaders who immediately surround the king of Persia.[5] It at the same time mentions the name of one of these celestial primates or archangels, Raphael,[6] who serves as guide to young Tobias, accompanies him to foreign parts, and brings him back to his home. The book of Daniel makes us acquainted with the names of two other archangels, *viz.:* Gabriel[7] and Michael.[8] Other Jewish writings contain several others.[9]

The development of angelology that we have just noticed appears also in the fact that the Jews attributed to the angels the government and protection of the various peoples of the earth. In the book of Daniel, for example, the angel Michael is represented as the leader and protector of Israel, and at the same time reference is made to a leader of the kingdom of Persia and a leader of Javan.[10]

[1] Ezek. ix. [2] iv. 10 ; iii. 9. [3] x. 13. [4] xii. 15 ; comp. Rev. viii. 2.
[5] Esther i. 10, 14. [6] Tob. iii. 16 ; ix. 5 ; xii. 15.
[7] viii. 16 ; ix. 21 ; comp. Luke i. 19, 26.
[8] x. 13, 21 ; xii. 1 ; comp. Judith ix. ; Rev. xii. 7.
[9] Nicolas, pp. 221 f. ; Stapfer, pp. 53 ff. ; [Toy, pp. 149 ff.].
[10] x. 13, 20 f. ; xii. 1.

The version of the Seventy even makes Deut. xxxii. 8 say that, on the dispersion of the sons of Adam, God fixed the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the angels of God. This is giving to each people an angel as a guardian, an idea expressed also by Sirach.[1] These celestial protectors[2] waged war with one another, each defending the people that had been especially confided to him.[3] They constantly watched over their charges.[4]

We remark, finally, that angels surround the throne of God to execute, under his supervision, judgment upon the world.[5]

It follows from the above that angelology was well developed in Judaism. The Persian religion doubtless had some influence upon it.[6] But there must also have been an internal process analogous to that which, in the Catholic church, has more and more magnified the saints and their functions.

## § 29. DEMONOLOGY.

Angelology had its roots in Hebraism although it did not reach its doctrinal development until later; demonology, on the contrary, had its origin in Judaism. We have seen that, in the eyes of the Hebrews, God could do evil as well as good, and he did the one or the other according to circumstances, by his spirit or through other agents, especially his *malakh*.

The first passage in which there is a reference to an

[1] xvii. 17. [2] 2 Macc. xi. 10. [3] Dan. x. 13, 20.
[4] Dan. iv. 13, 17, 23. [5] Dan. vii. 9 f.; comp. Zech. iii. 1, 3.
[6] Nicolas, pp. 48 ff., 227 ff.

evil spirit is 1 Kings xxii. 19–23. Jehovah is seated on his throne, and surrounded by the whole heavenly host. He says to those about him: "Who will mislead Ahab?" One replies in one way, another in another. Then the spirit approaches, stands before Jehovah, and declares that he will go forth to mislead Ahab, becoming a lying spirit in the mouths of all his prophets. This is done, and the prophet Micaiah says to Ahab: "Jehovah hath sent a lying spirit into the mouths of all thy prophets." There is, as will be observed, a difference between this account and the one that we cited in the preceding period concerning the spirit of God. The spirit that is here referred to does not seem to be a simple power or emanation from Jehovah. He belongs to a council of personal beings; he seems himself to be a personal spirit. He is called *haruach*, the spirit, though most of the translators omit the article. However, we do not by any means find here the notion of Satan. The lying spirit belongs to the host of the heavens; he is one of the servants of God. Micaiah says also that it is Jehovah who has sent a lying spirit into the mouths of all the prophets of Ahab. This spirit is in reality the spirit of prophecy. Hence especially the article. God, who ordinarily sent it to the prophets to communicate to them the truth, now sends it to declare a lie, because this enters into his providential purposes. We still have here, therefore, to some extent an expression of the old Israelitish view.

If we pass to the book of Job we find in it, with respect to the question under discussion, as it were, a transitional stage between Hebraism and Judaism, *i.e.* the beginning of demonology. In the first two chapters

Jehovah appears surrounded by the sons of God, in the midst of whom is Satan. He, with the consent of God, puts Job to the proof, sending upon him the various misfortunes[1] with which the reader is familiar. The real signification of the word *satan* is clearly seen in a number of passages in which it means *adversary*.[2] Satan appears also as the adversary of Job.

It is interesting to compare with the Satan of the book of Job what we read Num. xxii. 22 and 32. Here we see the angel of Jehovah, who is oftenest a protecting *malakh*, playing the part of a satan, an adversary. The term *satan* is used without an article as a common noun. In the book of Job, on the contrary, we find ourselves confronted by a person whose proper name is Satan, *has-satan*, with the article. As will be observed there is an analogy between this being and the spirit of whom we spoke above.

Are we here already confronted by a veritable Satan? Many theologians say no. "It is generally admitted," says M. Nicolas, "that this being has none of the characteristics that befit a spirit evil by nature. In the prologue to this book Satan fulfils the functions of a public prosecutor, nothing more. He smites Job only by express permission of God, and even then he only causes the angels of evil who execute the decrees of God to fulfil their office. He is, it is true, pictured as having little confidence in human virtue. But he does not, of his own motion, seek to lay snares for it, and prepare for it some signal overthrow. He is there-

[1] i. 6 ff.; ii. 1 ff.

[2] Num. xxii. 22, 32; 1 Sam. xxix. 4; 2 Sam. xix. 22; 1 Kings v. 18; xi. 14, 23, 25; Ps. cix. 6.

fore not the father of evil, in the proper sense of the expression."[1] Haag expresses himself to the same effect.[2] It is certain that the Satan of the book of Job is not that of traditional theology. He lacks one of the chief characteristics of the latter, he is not the adversary of God; on the contrary, he is of the number of his servants. He seems, however, to be a little nearer Satan than Nicolas and Haag would make him. He does not resemble a simple public prosecutor to the extent of being "personally indifferent to the result," as the latter of these scholars expresses it. Is he not happy to find Job wanting, to show that his piety is purely selfish? Does he not begrudge him his happiness? Does he not, with unalloyed malignity, profit by the permission to try him?

In Zech. iii. 1, Satan appears as accuser before God's tribunal. But he finds himself sharply rebuked by the supreme judge. In this case he plays, in a sense, the part of adversary of the kingdom of God, since he attacks the high-priest, the most exalted representative of the chosen people. Joshua, in fact, is not accused on account of his own sins; he figures in this vision as high-priest; it is his sacerdotal garment that is soiled, and Satan claims that there is no expiation for the people, loaded with sins, and that consequently Israel should be rejected.[3] It is, therefore, the opposition of God to Satan and reciprocally of Satan to God, that appears in this passage.

The last canonical passage that speaks of Satan is 1 Chron. xxi. 1. Satan is there said to arise against Israel, and incite David to make a census of the people, *i.e.* to

[1] p. 243; [Toy, p. 165]. [2] p. 416. [3] Oehler, § 200.

act contrary to the will of God, and thus bring upon Israel divine penalties. Satan, therefore, here appears as the adversary of the people of God and of God himself. This passage, compared with the parallel passage, 2 Sam. xxiv. 1, shows us the difference between the Hebrew and the Jewish point of view relative to the question under discussion. In the older account it is God who moves David to make the census; God is therefore still regarded as the sole and supreme author of all that happens, of evil as well as good. In the passage from Chronicles we find an entirely different conception, the fear of bringing reproach upon the majesty of God by placing him in immediate contact with the world, and especially by attributing evil to him; this fear makes it necessary to have recourse to the influence of evil spirits to explain the existence of evil.

The Satan of the Old Testament is then not yet the prince of this world. We find there, however, the starting point of the demonology of later times. We have yet, it is true, to consider some canonical passages that have often been cited in support of this doctrine.

Traditional theology has tried to find the devil in the serpent of the account of the Fall. This is an error. This serpent is a genuine beast of the field, created by God.[1] He is, it is true, a marvellous animal, but he is not more wonderful than the trees that, like him, are found in the garden of Eden. On a soil that produces such trees, the existence of an animal of this sort is nothing that should astonish us. In other religions of antiquity the serpent, moreover, plays an analogous

[1] Gen. iii. 1, 14.

part.[1] We entirely agree with Baudissin who says on this subject: "The serpent does not here appear as the incarnation of any supernatural power. The idea that it is Satan who speaks for it has been read into the account by later interpretation, it has not been drawn from it. Though the serpent speaks it does not, in so doing, leave the bounds of the animal kingdom, any more than Balaam's ass when it speaks; for the whole narrative bears a mythical character. Neither is wickedness attributed to it; but to explain sin, which cannot have its origin in man, created good by God, the cause of it must be ascribed to some other being. None appeared fitter for it than the serpent, which inspires aversion in man, and which the Semites regarded as more cunning than the other animals."[2]

The attempt has also been made to find the devil in the *shedhim*,[3] and the *seïrim*[4] as well as in *azazel*.[5] The exact signification of these terms, which are found only in the passages cited, is not easy to determine. However, competent modern exegetes no longer admit that they denote the devil, but simply species of phantoms, sprites, or evil spirits, that existed only in popular belief.[6] Since there is reference to them only in some few passages, almost all of recent date, it would not be proper to see in them integral elements of the religion of Israel. In several passages the sacred authors treat even these imaginary beings as vain idols, while the unfaithful Israelites offer them sacrifices.[7]

[1] Baudissin, I. pp. 255 ff. [2] I. p. 290. [3] Deut. xxxii. 17; Ps. cvi. 37.
[4] Lev. xvii. 7; Isa. xiii. 21; xxxiv. 14; 2 Chron. xi. 15.
[5] Lev. xvi. 8, 10 f., 26.
[6] See Knobel on Lev. xvi. 10; xvii. 7; Deut. xxxii. 17; Isa. xiii. 21.
[7] Deut. xxxii. 17; Ps. cvi. 37; Lev. xvii. 7; 2 Chron. xi. 15.

When we pass to the apocryphal books we find, Wis. ii. 23 f., the idea that God had created man for immortality, that he had made him in his own image, but that the devil, out of envy, introduced death into the world. This is the first time that the tempting serpent of the account of the Fall is identified with the devil. In the book of Baruch, idols and demons are identified.[1] The version of the Seventy, in a number of passages, renders the words denoting idols or spectres, *demons*.[2] The demons are thought to prefer the desert for their dwelling-place.[3] They are called evil spirits.[4]

The book of Tobit gives us the proper name of a demon that plays an important part in the narrative; he is called Asmodeus. He is enamored of Sara, daughter of Raguel, and slays one after another her seven former husbands.[5] But the son of Tobit, by the advice of the angel Raphael, puts him to flight, by burning, the day before his marriage with Sara, the heart and the liver of a fish, the smell of which the demon cannot endure.[6] In Upper Egypt, whither Asmodeus escapes, he is strangled by Raphael.[7]

We see that demonology was considerably developed in the midst of Judaism, and the ground prepared for the more complete demonology of later ages. Dualism, so thoroughly antagonistic to the ancient religion of Israel, after the Jews, from the Exile onward, be-

[1] iv. 7.

[2] Deut. xxxii. 17; Isa. xiii. 21 (Sept. 23); xxxiv. 14; lxv. 11; Ps. xcvi. 5; cv. 37 (Sept. xcv. 5, and cv. 37).

[3] Bar. iv. 35; Tob. viii. 3. [4] Tob. vi. 8. [5] iii. 8; vi. 14.

[6] vi. 8, 15–17; viii. 2 f. [7] viii. 3.

came acquainted with it through the Persian religion, seems to have powerfully assisted the development of Jewish demonology.

## § 30. DEATH AND THE FUTURE LIFE.

Of all the questions relating to man the only one that we have to treat here is that concerning death and the future life.

Respecting death there exists a twofold view in the Old Testament. On the one hand it is regarded as something natural; on the other, it appears as the consequence and the penalty of sin. This can be shown even from the first narratives of document A.

In fact we see God threaten Adam with death in case he shall transgress his will,[1] and after the transgression execute his threat.[2] But in the same fragment, we read that man was taken from the dust of the earth, and that he will return to it.[3] Though he represents death as at once a penalty and a natural consequence of the terrestrial origin of man, our author reconciles this twofold view by showing that man would have been able to rise to a higher and eternal life by the special grace of God, and obedience to his will. Man had the right to eat of the tree of life, the tree that communicates eternal life, and he lost this right only in consequence of his disobedience.[4] Though man was mortal by nature he could have attained to immortality by his faithfulness to God. In the old fragment, Gen. vi. 1–4, man

[1] Gen. ii. 17; iii. 3. [2] Gen. iii. 19, 22–24.
[3] Gen. ii. 7; iii. 19; comp. Ps. xc. 3; cxlvi. 4.
[4] Gen. ii. 9, 16; iii. 22 ff.

is called flesh,[1] like the animals, which seems to imply the idea that he is mortal by virtue of his physical constitution. But the same fragment says that God reduced to a hundred and twenty years the duration of human life, which had formerly been much longer, and that he did this to punish human perversity. According to the account of the Fall, man dies because he can no longer eat of the fruit of the tree of life. According to the passage just cited, on the contrary, his days are reduced because the spirit of God, the vital principle of every thing that exists, will not always remain in man.

The translation of Enoch and Elijah[2] seems also to indicate that man was not necessarily subject to death, that death was not inseparable from human nature. The same thought recurs in the prophetic declaration that foretells the abolition of death under the reign of the Messiah.[3] We see, finally, that dead bodies, and all that came into contact with them, were regarded as unclean and defiled,[4] as things for which God feels repulsion, and which he cannot have desired. It also follows from a multitude of other passages too numerous to be cited here that death, while appearing natural, is yet, according to the Old Testament as a whole, the result and the principal penalty of sin.

What did the Israelites think of the condition of man after death? Though the contrary has often been asserted, it is certain that, from remote antiquity, the Hebrews believed in the survival of the dead, in a future life. This is proven by the practice of invok-

[1] *v.* 3. [2] Gen. v. 24; 2 Kings ii. [3] Isa. xxv. 8; comp. xxvi. 19.
[4] Num. v. 2; xix. 11 ff.; Hag. ii. 13.

ing the dead, which was so deeply rooted, that in spite of repeated and severe prohibitions, it was long maintained in Israel.[1] Though it was forbidden, this was not because there was doubt about the survival of the dead; but the invocation of the dead was regarded as a superstition, and a token of unfaithfulness to Jehovah, who alone was to be consulted. It is said that the dead "have been gathered with the fathers," with the ancestors, not only in the recent passages of document C,[2] but also in those of an earlier date.[3] This formula is employed even when the dead have not been buried with the fathers. Thus Jacob says that he shall go down with sorrow to his son Joseph, to the abode of the dead,[4] though he believed that this son had been devoured by a wild beast. Is it not also faith in a sojourn of the dead where the departed are found again, that dictated the words of David on the death of a dear child: "I shall go to him; but he will not return to me?"[5] Without faith in a future existence the translation of Enoch and Elijah would be difficult to explain. And then the various resurrections mentioned in the Old Testament:[6] are they not incompatible with the idea that death is a complete destruction of a human being? Though some passages speak of death as destruction,[7] it is so called because it is the destruc-

[1] 1 Sam. xxviii. 3, 7 ff.; Isa. viii. 19; xix. 3; xxix. 4; Deut. xviii. 11; Lev. xix. 31; xx. 6, 27; 2 Kings xxi. 6; xxiii. 24.

[2] Gen. xxv. 8, 17; xxxv. 29; xlix. 29, 33; Num. xx. 24, 26; xxvii. 13; Deut. xxxii. 50.

[3] Gen. xv. 15; Jud. ii. 10; 2 Sam. vii. 12; 1 Kings i. 21; ii. 10; xi. 21. [4] Gen. xxxvii. 35. [5] 2 Sam. xii. 23.

[6] 1 Kings xvii. 21 ff.; 2 Kings iv. 34 ff.; xiii. 21.

[7] Job vii. 8, 21; xiv. 10; Isa. xxxviii. 18; xxvi. 14; Ps. xxxvii. 36; xxxix. 13.

tion, the end of the present life,[1] or because the future life appears unreal as compared with the present. Ecclesiastes without doubt places man on the same level as the beast, and finds that their lot is the same.[2] But in this entire book appears a skepticism and a pessimism that is not found in any other book of the Old Testament. It is therefore unfair to regard the view that it expresses as that of the Hebrew Scriptures.

The abode of the dead is called *sheol*, a word whose etymology is not perfectly certain. It is found even in document A.[3] When we examine more closely what the Old Testament says about the abode of the dead we find that the Israelites had no very definite ideas on the subject, that they hardly thought of the departed except to represent their condition as a lamentable one. They pictured to themselves *sheol* as an abyss, where man will perish, in a sense, after death; for the word *abhaddon*, a synonym of *sheol* and of *death* in several passages,[4] means at the same time *abyss* and *destruction*. This abyss is in the depths of the earth.[5] It is an insatiable gulf,[6] whence nothing can return.[7] It is a dark[8] and silent[9] place. It is the region of

[1] Job vii. 8–10. [2] iii. 18–21.

[3] Gen. xxxvii. 35; xlii. 38; xliv. 29.

[4] Job xxvi. 6; xxviii. 22; Prov. xv. 11; xxvii. 20.

[5] Num. xvi. 30–33; Job xxvi. 5; Ps. xxx. 3; lv. 15; lxiii. 10; Prov. vii. 27; ix. 18; xv. 24; Isa. xiv. 9, 15; Ezek. xxvi. 20; xxxi. 14 f., 18; xxxii. 18, 21, 24.

[6] Isa. v. 14; Hab. ii. 5; Prov. i. 12; xxvii. 20; xxx. 16.

[7] Job vii. 9; xvi. 22; xvii. 13–15.

[8] Job x. 22; xvii. 13; xviii. 18; Jer. xiii. 16; Ps. xlix. 19; lxxxviii. 6, 12; cxliii. 3; Lam. iii. 6.

[9] Isa. xxxviii. 18; Ps. xxx. 9; xxxi. 17; lxxxviii. 10; xciv. 17; cxv. 17.

forgetfulness,[1] where nothing is seen, or done more,[2] where there is no longer even any relation with God,[3] though self-consciousness, personality, is not lost.[4] Rich and poor, good and bad, great and small, all men there mingle with one another.[5] There is, in fact, no retribution after this life.[6] The earth is called "land of the living," in contrast with Sheol.[7] Existence in Sheol more nearly resembles death than life, it is only an apparent life; for the departed are *rephaim*, *i.e.* shades;[8] it is in a sense a state of perpetual sleep.[9]

It is easy, in view of the above statements, to believe that the prospect of the future life had no attraction for the Israelites, that it could only fill them with profound sadness. Death appeared to them without hope;[10] it was like the king of terrors;[11] it was desirable only in extreme misfortune, and to put an end to it.[12] It also follows from the above that faith in a future life was without any value, and without any religious or moral influence, becaues it did not involve the idea of

[1] Ps. lxxxviii. 12.

[2] Job iii. 13, 17; xiv. 21; xvii. 16; Eccl. ix. 5 f., 10; Ps. vi. 5.

[3] Ps. lxxxviii. 5; Isa. xxxviii. 18.

[4] 1 Sam. xxviii. 15 ff.; Ezek. xxxii. 21; Job xiv. 22; xxvi. 5; xxviii. 22. [5] Ezek. iii. 13–19; Ps. xlix. 10–14.

[6] Eccl. ix. 5.

[7] Job xxviii. 13; Ps. xxvii. 13; lii. 5; cxvi. 9; cxlii. 5; Isa. xxxviii. 11; liii. 8; Jer. xi. 19; Ezek. xxvi. 20; xxxii. 23, 32.

[8] Job xxvi. 5; Ps. lxxxviii. 10; Prov. ii. 18; ix. 18; xxi. 16; Isa. xiv. 9; xxvi. 14, 19.

[9] Job iii. 13; xiv. 12; Jer. li. 39, 57.

[10] 2 Sam. xiv. 14; Job vii. 7 ff.; x. 20–22; xiv. 7–22; xvii. 11–16; Isa. xxxviii. 1 ff., 10 ff.; Ps. cxvi. 3.

[11] Job xviii. 14.

[12] Job iii. 3–5, 21; vi. 8 f.; xiv. 13; Isa. lvii. 1 f.

a retribution beyond the tomb. God punishes the wicked, not after death, but by death, by an unhappy and premature death.[1] God blesses the righteous, not with everlasting life, but with a long and happy earthly existence.[2] The hope of having a numerous posterity, and surviving in ones' children is a far fairer prospect than that of the future life.[3]

We conclude from the above that it is equally wrong to maintain that the Israelites did not believe in a future life, or to attribute to them the hope of everlasting life in the Christian sense, two errors into which men have alternately fallen. If faith in eternal life, and consequently in a judgment with everlasting rewards and penalties, had been disseminated in Israel it would certainly have been introduced into the Pentateuch as a sanction for the law, and into the preaching of the prophets as a stimulus to faithfulness. But everywhere, even in the most recent legislative and prophetical documents recourse is had only to temporal promises and threats, to incite to good, or to deter from evil. In Israel, in fact, faith in everlasting life was not by any means what it has become through the gospel; it filled with terror and not with hope; it could not therefore under the old covenant play the part that it does under the new. Moreover it should not be forgotten that in all the documents antedating the Exile,

[1] Gen. vi. f.; xviii. f.; xxxviii. 7; Lev. x. 1 ff.; Num. xvi.; 2 Sam. xii. 13 f.; Jer. xxxi. 30; Ezek. iii. 18, 20; xviii.; xxxiii. 8 f., 12 f.; Job xi. 20; xxiv. 19; etc.

[2] Ex. xx. 12; Lev. xviii. 5; Deut. iv. 1, 40; v. 33; vi. 2, 24; viii. 1; xi. 8 f.; xxx. 15–20; xxxii. 47; Amos v. 4, 6, 14; Hab. ii. 4; Ezek. xviii. 9, 17, 19, 21 f., 27 f.; xx. 11; xxxiii. 14 ff.; etc.

[3] Gen. xii. 2 f.; xv. 2 ff.; xvii. 4; xxvi. 3 f.; xxviii. 14.

this faith appears as a simple popular belief, and nowhere as an integral part of the religion of Israel.

The attempt has, however, been made to find a more or less evangelical hope of everlasting life, if not in all the Israelites, at least in some choice spirits. But if it existed it must have shown itself in the prophets, the *élite* of the nation. Now we have seen that, on the contrary, it is wanting in the teaching of the prophets. Let us, however, examine the passages in which this statement is believed to find support.

One of the principal is Job xix. 25–27. But in this book there is no lack of passages declaring that man, in spite of his righteousness, retains no hope after death.[1] More than this, the entire book is incomprehensible if the author believed in the everlasting felicity of the righteous. The problem that is there discussed would, in fact, have found in this faith a natural solution, and would have completely lost the tragical character with which he has invested it.[2] What then is the meaning of the passage in question? It is partially explained by xvi. 19–22, where Job, foreseeing that the number of his years approaches its end, expresses the hope that God will be his advocate, and vindicate him against his accusing friends. The same idea is expressed xix. 25–27, but in language much more enthusiastic. Job there repeats that after his death God will be his avenger, his defender, to vindicate him against the unjust accusations that his friends direct against him. He "is convinced that in spite of appearances God will in

[1] vii. 6 f.; x. 20 f.; xiv.; xvii. 13 ff.

[2] Comp. Reuss, *Philosophie*, p. 22; *Gesch.*, § 238; Schultz, II. pp. 329 ff.

the end publicly recognize his innocence, and if he does not do so before his death, he will at least do so afterward. . . . He *sees* beforehand this vindication, his heart leaps with agitation in view of this prospect."[1]

It is also maintained that in some passages of Proverbs, everlasting felicity is promised to the righteous. The most important of these passages are xiv. 32 and xv. 24. In the former we read that, "The just findeth a refuge even in his death," and in the latter that "for the wise the path of life leadeth upward, that he may shun the abode of the dead which is below." Oehler does not think it possible to find here the hope of everlasting life, because there is no indication that the life, which in certain passages of Proverbs is represented as the reward of wisdom, is life beyond the tomb.[2] He thinks that, in the first of these passages, the author speaks perhaps either of the confidence of the righteous in extreme danger, or of the hope that animates him, in the face of death, touching the future of his posterity (such as Jacob expresses, Gen. xlix. 18), or touching his own memory (in the sense of Prov. x. 7, which says that the memory of the righteous is a blessing). He holds that in the second passage there is reference only to a long and blissful earthly life, secured by divine protection.[3] It should, moreover, be observed that, according to the version of the Seventy, the former of these passages speaks of the confidence that the righteous may have in his virtue, not of that which he may have at the time of death. This proves that the first translators did not find in it the hope of everlasting felicity. On the latter passage, which says of the wise

[1] Reuss, *l.l.* [2] ii. 21 f.; iii. 16; x. 30; etc. [3] § 243.

that the path of life leads upward in contrast with Sheol which is below, Reuss remarks that "the ascent of the first line is suggested by the descent of the second," so that "it is not necessary to think here of immortality."[1]

Finally the attempt has been made to find the hope of everlasting felicity in some psalms. It would not be surprising if this were the case, since these psalms may date from a time when such a hope really existed among the Jews. The first of the passages brought forward is Ps. xvi. 10 f.: "Thou wilt not abandon my soul to the abode of the dead; thou wilt not permit thy well-beloved to see the pit. Thou wilt make known to me the path of life; there is fulness of joy before thee, there are delights at thy right hand forever." But, frankly, we, with many exegetes, see here only the hope of being delivered from danger of death, and of tasting the delights of communion with God, which for the psalmist is the highest good.[2] As for the expression "forever," it should not be pressed to the extent of finding in it everlasting duration, since expressions of this kind in the Old Testament often have only a very restricted and relative signification. Another passage that should be taken into account is Ps. xlix. 15, where we read: "God will save my soul from the abode of death, for he will take me," which perhaps means he will take me, like Enoch, to himself. Many exegetes, however, deny that in this passage there is reference to the hope of everlasting life. Reuss, in favor of this opinion, brings forward a number of considerations that have weight. In any case, the text, considered in itself, might, like others of the same kind,

[1] Reuss, *l.l.*

[2] *v.* 2.

mean that God will save the psalmist from death. But when the context is considered, when it becomes apparent that verse 15 is contrasted with the verses preceding, which say of those who perish that they are placed in the abode of the dead, and that death makes them his pasture,[1] — this would lead us to think that there is here reference to a salvation beyond the tomb. It remains to consider Ps. lxxiii. 24–26. Here also in contrast with the wicked, who are overthrown, destroyed, annihilated by a sudden end,[2] the psalmist hopes that he will be exalted to glory, and have God for his portion forever, when even his flesh and his heart are decayed. In this, as in the preceding passage, the author aspires to be united with God, to obtain glory and felicity forever; consequently he expresses some hope of obtaining this favor. But none of these passages expresses a full and complete confidence in everlasting salvation.

The first and the only canonical passage in which such a hope is confidently asserted is Dan. xii. 2 f., where we read: "Many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth will awake, some to everlasting life, and others to shame, to everlasting disgrace. Those who have had understanding will shine like the brightness of the heavens, and those who have taught the multitude righteousness, will shine like the stars for ever and ever." Here the idea of everlasting life is expressed with all the clearness to be desired, and with it the idea of the resurrection of the dead, of a future retribution, of everlasting punishments for the wicked, and eternal felicity for the righteous. It should, however, be noticed that

[1] *vv.* 7–14. [2] *vv.* 16 ff.

there is no reference in Daniel to a universal resurrection. A part only of those who sleep will awake. It is probable that to the mind of the author, the favor of a resurrection is reserved for the Jews only.[1] Faith in the resurrection of the dead is also expressed in the second book of Maccabees,[2] where we see that prayers for the dead early begin to be united with this faith.[3]

The question has been much discussed, through what foreign influence the Jews attained to the idea of the resurrection of the dead; but this discussion has not issued in perfectly reliable results.[4] For biblical theology it is more interesting to show that the germs of this doctrine exist in some prophetical passages, and that it may have arisen in the midst of Judaism without foreign influence. The prophets had always foretold the destruction, the death of Israel, as a punishment for their sins.[5] But they could not admit their complete annihilation. Hence the frequently expressed idea of a remnant that will abide after the divine judgment and penalties, and form a new people of God, in a new era. This restoration is by several prophets represented as a resurrection of the destroyed people.[6] Now the idea of collective resurrection could easily lead to that of individual resurrection, which seems to break forth, Isa. xxvi. 19.

The germs of this doctrine, which we have just shown

[1] Hitzig and Reuss, *i.l.*

[2] vii. 9, 11, 14, 23, 29, 36; xii. 43 ff.; xiv. 46. [3] xii. 43 ff.

[4] Nicolas, pp. 325 ff.

[5] Hos. vi. 5; ix. 6; xiii. 1; Isa. i. 4–9; Mic. iii. 12; Deut. xxx. 15 ff.; Jer. iv.; Ezek. xxxiii. 11; Lam. ii. 17.

[6] Hos. vi. 1–3; xiii. 14; Ezek. xxxvii. 1–14; Isa. xxvi. 18 f.; lxv. 17–19.

to have existed in the teaching of the prophets, appear to have been developed especially during the sore persecutions that were directed against the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes; this, in fact, is the epoch at which it presents itself to us in the book of Daniel. "The feverish expectation of the end, a hatred of oppression that was not satisfied by the prospect of a temporal and fleeting vengeance, above all the conviction that eternal righteousness could not allow the countless victims who died for their God and their faith, to fall unrewarded, all these causes finally gave rise to the belief in the resurrection of the dead, and a judgment beyond the tomb."[1] This belief, then, appears as a product of messianic hopes, and faith in divine justice.[2]

Along with the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, which arose and was developed among the Palestinian Jews, we see the doctrine of the immortality of the soul take shape among the Jews of Alexandria. It appears for the first time in one of our apocryphal books, *viz.* in Wisdom. The author seems to have been forced to emphasize this thought by epicureanism, which denied the future life, and had for a device: Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we shall die.[3] According to this book souls pre-exist,[4] and are confined in the body as in a prison;[5] God in creating man in his own image, created him to be imperishable, immortal,[6] as he did all other things;[7] he did not make death, and he finds no pleasure in seeing the living perish;[8] death

[1] Reuss, *Apocalypse*, p. 8.

[2] Reuss, *Théol. Chrét.*, I. pp. 76 f.; Nicolas, pp. 355 ff.; Seinecke, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, pp. 144 f.; [Montefiore, *Lectures*, p. 456].

[3] ii. 1–20. [4] viii. 19 f. [5] ix. 15. [6] ii. 23. [7] i. 14. [8] i. 13.

entered the world through the envy of the devil,[1] but righteousness is not subject to death;[2] observance of the divine ordinances gives assurance of immortality, and immortality assimilates to God;[3] the souls of the righteous are in the hands of God, — fools only can believe that they die,— their hope is immortal; after having passed through the crucible of trial, they shine, they judge the nations, they govern the peoples;[4] thus the righteous will live forever.[5] The wicked seem to be condemned to death, to annihilation.[6] On the other hand, however, there are signs of a belief that they also live forever, and that they even know the lot of the righteous.[7] For, "in the language of our author, the term *dead* already has the figurative signification in which we find it used in the New Testament, *viz.* that of damnation, the absolute want of felicity."[8] These ideas are still further developed by Philo, from whose writings it clearly appears that they were borrowed from Plato.[9]

Once more, in conclusion, we notice the difference that in the beginning existed between the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead and that of the immortality of the soul, since confounded in Christian dogmatics. The doctrine of the resurrection, which is more especially Jewish and theological, started from the idea that God is able to restore the dead to life.[10] The more philosophical doctrine of the immortality of the soul, which

[1] ii. 24. [2] i. 15. [3] vi. 18 f.; viii. 17; xv. 3.
[4] iii. 1–9. [5] v. 15 f. [6] i. 15 f.; iii. 10–19; iv. 19; v. 14.
[7] v. 1–13. [8] Reuss, *Philosophie*, p. 510.
[9] Nicolas, pp. 318 ff.; comp. Haag, pp. 421 f.; von Cölln, § 108; [Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, III. pp. 196 ff.].
[10] See 2 Macc. vii. 23; comp. Nicolas, p. 327.

sprang from the school of Plato, reckoned immortality among the attributes of the soul. According to it the soul, being imperishable by nature, cannot die, does not need to be revived, recreated, to attain to everlasting life. By death it is delivered from the prison of the body; it flees to the celestial regions, and naturally partakes of life everlasting. The Greek doctrine of immortality is therefore absolutely independent of the Jewish doctrine of the resurrection. They were at first two separate currents, starting from two different sources. But the Christian teachers, nourished at the same time by Jewish theology and Greek philosophy, united the two currents, combined the two doctrines.

## § 31. LEVITISM.

Judaism is, in some respects, the reverse of prophetism as it appears in its most illustrious representatives. The latter attributes the greatest importance to the moral life and law, and subordinates to them all the external practices of religion. After the Exile, on the contrary, a capital importance was attributed to the purely ritualistic Levitical laws and external worship. It is no longer the spirit and the life that play the principal part as in the prophets, but form and ceremony. Compared with prophetical spiritualism, Judaism represents the formalistic tendency. This is the reason why we shall speak of Levitism and all that is connected therewith, before speaking of the moral life.

Ezekiel marks the first decisive step towards the triumph of Levitism. In most of his discourses, it is true, the prophetical spirit is still felt. But there is a

part of his book, beginning with chapter xl., that has not its like in any earlier prophet. This portion describes the restoration of Israel from the Levitical point of view. Instead of making the essence of piety and the hope for the salvation of Israel the conversion of the heart, the knowledge of God, the practice of the duties of justice and charity, the prophet here bases the grandest expectations upon the priesthood and external worship. Ezekiel was at once a priest and a prophet; so also his book is the expression both of prophetism and Levitism.

The fragment, Lev. xvii. – xxvi., which perhaps originated with Ezekiel or one of his disciples, also indicates a two-fold current. In chapters xviii. – xx. moral laws predominate. In the other chapters, on the contrary, are found almost only ritualistic laws.

The prophets who arose after the Exile, and who by the way were few in number, were all partly influenced by the Levitical spirit. Haggai gives his attention almost exclusively to the restoration of the temple.[1] He attributes unusual importance to the part of the high-priest Joshua.[2] In Zechariah the same prepossessions recur.[3] But the Levitical tendency manifests itself especially in Malachi. He calls the priest a messenger or angel of Jehovah.[4] The first and greatest breach of loyalty that he notices is the presentation of unclean victims.[5] Conversion and faithfulness toward God in his eyes amount to the regular payment of tithes.[6]

This tendency issues in document C, whose legisla-

[1] i. f. [2] i. 1, 12; ii. 2, 4. [3] iii. 1–8; iv. 1 ff., 14; vi. 9 ff.
[4] ii. 7; comp. Eccl. v. 6. [5] i. 6.–14. [6] iii. 7–10.

tion has for its sole object the regulation, to the least details, of all that relates to the sanctuary, the priesthood, sacrifices, Levitical purity, religious feasts, offerings, the hierarchical division of the priesthood and the people.[1] Even the historical setting of this document betrays a Levitical tendency. With the account of creation is connected the institution of the Sabbath;[2] with that of the deluge, the prohibition against eating blood;[3] with that of the covenant made with Abraham, the practice of circumcision;[4] with that of the exodus from Egypt, the institution of the passover.[5] Other narratives of this document are intended to glorify the priesthood, or inculcate the strict observance of the ceremonial laws.[6] Thus Wellhausen could say that in this document the essential thing is that the sacrifices be offered according to the regulations: at the lawful place, at the lawful time, by the lawful persons, and according to lawful procedure.[7] Reuss has said less justly that the important thing is not the purity of the heart, but that of the body and of dishes.[8]

This legislation Ezra and Nehemiah sought to apply, to realize in practical life. Their reform affects chiefly the external side of religion; they give the greatest care to the re-establishment of worship, and the strict observance of all the Levitical usages.[9] The Chronicles everywhere take for granted that the legislation of

[1] Ex. xxv.–xxxi. 17; xxxv.–xl.; Lev. i.–xvi.; xxvii.; Num. i.–x.; xv.; xviii. f.; xxviii.–xxx.; xxxv. [2] Gen. ii. 2 f.
[3] Gen. ix. 4. [4] Gen. xvii. 9 ff. [5] Ex. xii. 1 ff.
[6] Lev. x. 1 ff.; Num. xv. 32 ff.; xvi. 1 ff.; xvii. 1 ff.
[7] *History*, p. 424. [8] *Gesch.*, § 379.
[9] Ezra iii. 3–7; vi. 16–22; viii. 15–36; x. 17 ff.; Neh. viii. 14–18; x.–xiii.

document C has been in force since the days of Moses, and nothing appears to their author more worthy of mention than details relating to Levitical worship, and especially those that magnify the priesthood. According to these books God grants his special blessing to those who observe the Levitical regulations, and severely punishes those who transgress them.[1]

This Levitical and formalistic tendency only grew with time, and it manifested itself in a thousand different ways. Fasting, mourning, tears, sacrifices, abstinence from unclean foods, observance of holidays, whose number is always increasing, constantly take higher and higher rank in Jewish piety.[2] Righteousness largely consists in this purely external piety.[3] The profanation of sacred things, a blow aimed at the Levitical regulations, — these are regarded as abominations.[4] Even prayer takes a formalistic character.[5] Thus Ecclesiastes already feels the need of opposing vain repetitions in prayer.[6]

Having thus, in a general way, described the devel-

[1] 1 Chron. vi. 31 ff., 48 ff., 54 ff. ; ix. 10–34 ; xiii. ; xv. f.; xxii. – xxvi. ; xxviii. f.; 2 Chron. ii. – vii. ; viii. 12–16 ; xi. 13–17 ; xiii. 9–15 ; xvii. 7–9 ; xix. 8–11 ; xx. 3, 21 f. ; xxiii. f. ; xxvi. 16–21 ; xxix. – xxxi. ; xxxv.

[2] Ezra viii. 21, 23 ; x. 1, 9 ; Neh. i. 4 ; ix. 1 ; Esther iv. 3, 16 ; ix. 19–32 ; Dan. i. 5–16 ; ix. 3 ; x. 3, 12 ; Bar. i. 5, 10 ; Tob. i. 6–8, 10–12 ; xii. 8 ; 1 Macc. ii. 32–38, 46 ; iii. 47 ; iv. 47–59 ; 2 Macc. i. 8 f., 18–36 ; iii. 31–33 ; vi. 6–11 ; vii. ; viii. 26–28 ; xii. 31 f., 38, 43 ; xiii. 12, 23 ; Judith iv. 9–15 ; viii. 6 ; ix. 1.

[3] Tob. i. 2 f. ; xii. 8 f.

[4] Ps. lxxiv. 3 ff. ; Dan. v. ; vii. 25 f. ; viii. 11–14 ; ix. 27 ; xii. 11 ; 1 Macc. i. 15, 21–28, 37, 41–64 ; iii. 48–51 ; iv. 36 ff. ; vi. 7 ; 2 Macc. iii. 18 ff. ; iv. 13–17 ; v. 15 f. ; vi. 1–7, 18 ff. ; xii. 39–42 ; xiii. 8 ; xv. 1–5, 18, 32 f. ; Judith iv. 2 f. ; viii. 21 ; ix. 8.

[5] Dan. vi. 10 ; 2 Macc. iii. 19–21 ; 3 Macc. i. 18 ; ii. 1. [6] v. 1.

opment and the triumph of Levitism, it is time to consider in detail the result of this influence upon worship.

## I. *The Sanctuary.*

We have seen how, in the first two periods, the multiplicity of places of worship which corresponds to a natural and legitimate need of the religious sentiment, favored idolatry and necessitated the centralization of worship, and how the way was prepared for this change, and it was partially accomplished by the erection of the temple at Jerusalem, the overthrow of the kingdom of the ten tribes, the discovery of Deuteronomy and the reform of Josiah, finally and especially by the Babylonian captivity which forever put an end to the constantly reviving idolatry of Israel.

In the documents of our period that give attention to this question it is not thought necessary to defend the centralization of worship against the worship of the high-places, as does even Deuteronomy. Ezekiel represents such centralization as a thing to be taken for granted.[1] It is the same with Haggai and Zechariah.[2] Other documents go farther. The centralization of worship appears in them not only as an accomplished fact but as something that has existed ever since Moses. This appears even in chapters xvii. – xxvi. of Leviticus, and especially in the legislation of document C. This document, and Chronicles as well, presents the past in an altogether ideal light. They both transfer to remote ages what exists in the present, or even what their

[1] Chaps. xl. – xliii. [2] Hag. i. f.; Zech. iv. 9 f.; vi. 12 f.

authors would like to see exist. It is therefore not history that is to be sought in them, but the expression of the religious ideas of the time when they were edited. Let us see what were these ideas respecting the sanctuary.

Document C describes in detail the construction of the tabernacle of the desert, as well as the furniture and the utensils required for worship.[1] The impossibility of rearing such a sanctuary in an utter desert was long ago demonstrated. Moreover, not the least trace of it has been found in early documents.[2] The Chronicles, in which document C is already regarded as history, alone speak of it.[3] But we have more to do than simply to establish this negative result. We must inquire after the religious thought that the authors of the narratives that speak of this sanctuary intended to express.

The principal idea that the Israelites always connected with the places of worship is that Jehovah is present at them. Since he is king of his people he must reside in the midst of them. Now his peculiar residence is the sanctuary. This idea is expressed even in the old song, Ex. xv. In *vv.* 17 and 18 the mountainous country of Canaan is called the heritage of Jehovah, into which he will lead his people, and the sanctuary, doubtless that of Zion, the abode that he has prepared. It is also said that Jehovah is king forever, evidently in the midst of his people, where he resides and exercises his sovereignty. Elsewhere Jehovah in his office of king of Israel dwells in the midst of the

[1] Ex. xxv. ff.; xxxv. ff. [2] Wellhausen, *History*, pp. 39 ff.
[3] 1 Chron. xvi. 39; xxi. 29; 2 Chron. i. 3 ff.

people, and especially in the temple, his peculiar residence, his throne, or more generally in Mount Zion and at Jerusalem.[1] Isaiah, in a vision, sees Jehovah, the king, seated on his throne in the sanctuary.[2]

In very many passages, to betake one's self to the sanctuary is synonymous with presenting one's self before Jehovah, and whatever is or is done at the sanctuary is or is done before Jehovah.[3] Consequently the sanctuary is called the abode of Jehovah.[4]

This fundamental thought of the religion of Israel, document C connects with the portable sanctuary, which it expressly calls the abode of Jehovah,[5] or more briefly the abode.[6] It says that there, and more especially over the ark, between the two cherubim, is where Jehovah prefers to dwell, in the midst of his people, and meet them, particularly Moses, to give them his commands.[7] Since the place for the ark was in the holy of holies,[8] this was more especially the abode of Jehovah. Moreover, this is nothing new. Even in document A Jehovah appears to Moses, and speaks to him in the tabernacle.[9] According to other old passages, Jehovah sits above the ark of the covenant between the

[1] Amos i. 2; Isa. viii. 18; xii. 6; xxiv. 23; Mic. iv. 7; Jer. iii. 17; viii. 19; Zeph. iii. 14 f.; Hab. ii. 20; Ezek. xliii. 7; Joel iii. 16 f.; Ps. xxiv. 3–10; xlviii. 2 f.; lxviii. 24. [2] Isa. vi. 1, 5.

[3] Ex. xxiii. 17; xxxiv. 23 f.; Josh. xviii. 8, 10; Jud. xi. 11; xx. 1, 23, 26; xxi. 2, 5, 8; 1 Sam. x. 3, 17; xi. 15; xv. 33; xxi. 6 f.; 2 Sam. v. 3; xxi. 7, 9; Deut. xii. 12; xiv. 23, 26; xvi. 11, 16; xxvi. 5, 10; xxxi. 11; etc. [4] Deut. xii. 5; 1 Kings viii. 13; Zech. ii. 13.

[5] Lev. xv. 31; xvii. 4; Num. xvi. 9; xvii. 13; xix. 13; xxxi. 30, 47; Josh. xxii. 19. [6] Ex. xxvi. 1, 6, 12 f., 15; etc.

[7] Ex. xxv. 8, 22; xxix. 42–46; xxx. 6, 36; Num. v. 3; vii. 89; xvii. 4. [8] Ex. xxvi. 33.

[9] Ex. xxxiii. 7–11; xxxiv. 34 f.; Num. xii. 5 ff.

cherubim.[1] Finally it is said that, in the temple of Solomon, the ark was placed in the holy of holies.[2]

Document C, in a fashion very characteristic, expresses the idea of the presence of Jehovah in the midst of his people, by the order of encampment that it prescribes, during the journey through the desert. The portable sanctuary is to form the centre of the camp; to the tribe of Levi is assigned the immediate neighborhood of the sanctuary; beyond them, on all sides, encamp the other tribes, in a perfectly symmetrical arrangement.[3] Those who consider this narrative with historical discrimination can see in it only a fiction. An encampment so regular, during the entire journey through the desert, was physically as impossible as the preparation of the magnificent tabernacle with all its accessories. Thus it is necessary to see in it only the symbolical expression of religious ideas presented in the form of history. This camp in the desert represents the people Israel, in the midst of whom Jehovah dwells, in the tabernacle, his residence, immediately surrounded by the sacerdotal tribe, the only one that has the right to be in direct relation with him, and the one that serves as an intermediary between him and the people.

It is only necessary to have called attention to the principal religious thought, which in Israel was connected with the sanctuary. For the details of the tabernacle and the temple we refer the reader to archæology. Traditional typology has tried to find profound thoughts, revelations, predictions, in all the details of the Israelitish sanctuary, and especially of the tabernacle so

[1] 1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2. [2] 1 Kings viii. 6 f. [3] Num. ii.

minutely described in document C.[1] But these mystical and often eccentric interpretations have no foundation in the Scriptures. Antiquity proceeded in this respect with extreme simplicity. Moreover, if the author of document C had really attributed to the sanctuary and its different parts the significance that some have believed to be found in them, he would have said so distinctly and even repeatedly in order to attract attention to it, as he does Ex. xxxi. 12–17 with reference to the significance of the Sabbath.[2] The best proof that the ancients were not devoted to this mystical typology, so much cultivated in later times, is that Solomon had the work on the temple done and the various sacred objects fashioned by foreign laborers and artists,[3] who certainly had no profound knowledge of the religion of Israel, and knew still less of the Christian religion, which an attempt has been made to find symbolized in the sanctuary of the old covenant. Document A says nothing at all of the way in which the tabernacle was constructed, which proves that it attributed no importance to the matter. Afterward, it is true, the opinion spread that the temple, like the tabernacle, and the sacred objects in general, had been made in accordance with divine instructions.[4] But this view, represented by document C and Chronicles, is of recent date, and it was inspired by the exaggerated value that was placed upon external worship, and all that contributed to worship, after the Exile. It is easy

[1] Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, art. *Stiftshütte;* Knobel, *Exodus u. Leviticus*, pp. 251 ff.; [Smith, *Dictionary*, art. *Tabernacle*].

[2] Knobel as above, p. 253. [3] 1 Kings v. 18; vii. 13 ff.

[4] Ex. xxv. 9, 40; 1 Chron. xxviii. 19.

to understand how those who close their eyes to the surest results of criticism, and believe that God gave the pattern of the tabernacle to Moses and that of the temple to David, are led to seek in these sanctuaries as wholes, and in each of their details, divine thoughts, mysteries of revelation. But as the early documents say nothing of the kind, and these teachings are found only in late documents, which generally present ancient history in a very ideal and unhistorical light, we cannot adopt this course.

## II. *The Priesthood.*

We have seen above that the liberty originally permitted every head of a family to perform sacerdotal functions, was little by little limited on account of the abuses that it occasioned, and that the tribe of Levi, from which the priesthood was from early times largely recruited, by the legislation of Deuteronomy, obtained the exclusive privilege of performing these functions. But we have not fonud before the Exile any important difference in the various priests, any religious hierarchy of the priesthood, much less any classification of the tribe of Levi into different divisions of sacred persons. According to Deuteronomy, as we have said, all the Levites were still priests, and all priests of the same rank. This state of things was greatly modified from the date of the Exile.

Here, again, it is Ezekiel who gives the first impulse. He makes no mention of the high-priest, it is true; but he establishes the distinction between priests and Levites. It should, however, be observed that he establishes it only in the legislation which he proposes

for the future; he speaks of it, therefore, as something that does not exist, and not as something of the past or the present. According to him the sons of Zadok alone of all the descendants of Levi, are to exercise the priestly functions.[1] He excludes from it first, strangers, the uncircumcised, and that in terms proving that previously even they were employed in the service of the sanctuary.[2] Further he excludes from it the unfaithful Levites, who had devoted themselves to idolatry, and assigns to them the inferior service of the sanctuary.[3] We find here, as in 2 Kings xxiii. 9, where there is also reference to a degradation of unfaithful priests, the historical reason why a part of the Levites were excluded from the priesthood, and the starting point for the distinction between priests and Levites.

The legislative programme of Ezekiel proves that, during the Exile, the ground was prepared for a new ecclesiastical legislation, forbidding the assumption of the priesthood to simple Israelites, and even making a selection in the tribe of Levi. In document C, in fact, the right to offer sacrifices is granted to Aaron and his sons exclusively forever.[4] Any other Israelite, even a Levite, who presumes to perform sacerdotal functions is threatened with death.[5] The priests are several times called simply sons of Aaron.[6] They alone are to bless the people[7] and approach God.[8] Over them is a high-

[1] xl. 46; xliii. 19; xliv. 15 ff.; xlviii. 11.
[2] xliv. 7–9. [3] xliv. 10–14; comp. xlviii. 11.
[4] Ex. xxviii. 1, 41; xxix. 9, 44; xl. 13–15; Num. iii. 3.
[5] Num. iii. 10, 38; iv. 15, 20; xviii. 3, 7.
[6] Lev. i. 5; ii. 2; iii. 5, 13; vi. 14 ff.; vii. 10, 33.
[7] Num. vi. 23; comp. Lev. ix. 22.
[8] Num. xvi. 5; comp. iv. 19 f.

priest, or anointed priest.[1] All the Levites who are not descended from Aaron are placed under the command of Aaron and his sons, to perform the inferior service of the sanctuary.[2] And just as no Levite can offer sacrifice without being punished with death, so no layman can meddle with the service of the Levites without suffering the same penalty.[3] The high-priest can come into immediate contact with God, in the holy of holies of the sanctuary, only at the great feast of atonement; he is threatened with death if he transgresses this commandment.[4]

According to this legislation, therefore, God withdraws himself completely from the eyes of his people, from whom a triple sacerdotal barrier separates him. The high-priest alone has the right to approach God, and he only once a year. "In him alone Israel comes into immediate contact with Jehovah, at one point, for one moment: the summit of the pyramid touches heaven."[5] This tendency to raise an insurmountable barrier between Jehovah and the common people has its rise in ancient Israel.[6] But it was long held in check by the powerful current of prophetism, which granted to every Israelite the right to approach God. Not until after the Exile, when prophetism died out, did it prevail. In characterizing as truly "colossal" the difference between the former view and that expressed in document C, Wellhausen justly dwells on the following point: "Samuel the Ephraimite, when on

[1] Num. xxxv. 25, 28; Lev. xxi. 10; viii. 12; iv. 3, 5, 16; Ex. xxix. 7.
[2] Num. iii. 6, 9; viii. 19; xviii. 2 ff., 23.
[3] Num. i. 51, 53; viii. 19; xviii. 22. [4] Lev. xvi.
[5] Wellhausen, *History*, p. 149. [6] Ex. xix. 21–25; 2 Sam. vi. 6 ff.

duty, nightly sleeps near the ark of Jehovah where, according to Lev. xvi., the high-priest alone has the right to present himself once a year, and then only after the strictest preparation and the performance of very elaborate expiatory ceremonies."[1] Another contrast that deserves more particular attention because the legislation of document C is represented as Mosaic, might be noticed, *viz.* that according to document A Joshua, an Ephraimite like Samuel,[2] and a mere layman withal, usually, in his capacity of servant of Moses, stays in the tabernacle of the desert.[3]

The author of document C, in his sacerdotal legislation, undoubtedly had an excellent object in view; he wished to help put an end to the abuses that favored idolatry. But the radical remedy that he proposed, and that succeeded only too well, resulted in Jewish clericalism. Though he helped to eradicate idolatry, he also helped to stifle religious life in forms, and led the religion of Israel into a wrong path from which the gospel alone could rescue it.

The influence that document C exercised on matters in general, and the priesthood in particular, shows itself especially in the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. The priests are there called sons of Aaron.[4] Those who cannot prove their descent from Aaron are excluded from the priesthood.[5] Aaron is there regarded as the first high-priest.[6] He and his descendants were set apart to perform the duties of the priesthood forever,

[1] *History*, p. 131. [2] Num. xiii. 8, 16. [3] Ex. xxxiii. 11.
[4] 1 Chron. xv. 4; 2 Chron. xiii. 9 f.; xxxi. 19; xxxv. 14; Neh. x. 38; xii. 47. [5] Ezra ii. 62 f.; Neh. vii. 64 f.
[6] Ezra vii. 5.

and to bless the people;[1] the other Levites are simple servants of the priests, charged with the inferior service of the sanctuary,[2] and more particularly with the transportation of the ark of the covenant.[3] It is only necessary to compare 1 Chron. xv. with 2 Sam. vi. to see how the history of times past was transformed to the eyes of posterity, who imagined that, in the domain of worship, everything had, since Moses, been done according to the legislation of document C.

The early literature contains no sacerdotal theory, no explanation or justification of the existence of the priesthood. The legislation of document A does not even speak of the priesthood at all. This document presupposes its existence in Israel before the promulgation of the law.[4] It is probable that in early times no need of establishing a theory on this subject was felt. There were priests in Israel as among the other peoples, because the common people feel the need of mediation between themselves and the Deity; and because they seek mediators, who, by reason of their peculiar sanctity, find, they think, more ready access to the Deity. This last was sufficiently justified by the existence of the priesthood everywhere in antiquity; it needed no other warrant.

The first passages that claim the priesthood for the tribe of Levi base this claim solely on the divine election of this tribe.[5] Deuteronomy itself, in its latest portion, though it gives much space to the priesthood,

[1] 1 Chron. xxiii. 13; vi. 49.

[2] 1 Chron. vi. 48; ix. 17 ff.; xxiii. 24 ff.

[3] 1 Chron. xv. 2, 15, 26; 2 Chron. v. 4; comp. Num. i. 50 ff.; iv. 15, 25 ff., 31 ff., 47.

[4] Ex. xix. 22, 24.

[5] Deut. x. 8; xxxiii. 8 ff.; 1 Sam. ii. 27 ff.

contains nothing else on this subject.[1] Document C, in all respects theoretical, is the first to give a sacerdotal theory. It is not content with emphasizing the divine election of the priesthood,[2] it seeks reasons for it. It declares that the first-born of Israel belong to Jehovah, because they were spared the night when all the first-born of the land of Egypt were smitten.[3] It says that Jehovah takes the Levites instead of the first-born of the children of Israel.[4] The real reason for the existence of the priesthood, according to this document, is that Jehovah is too holy to come into contact with a common mortal. All that it says about the priesthood tends to make it a sacred caste, separate from the rest of the people.

There is, first, the ceremony by which the Levites are consecrated, Num. viii. 5–22. It is an act of purification (the word purification itself occurs several times in the account) by which the Levites are separated from the rest of the children of Israel, that they may belong to Jehovah.[5] The priests are consecrated with even more solemnity than the Levites; but their consecration also consists of acts of purification and sanctification which separate the priests from the people, that they may be set apart for the service of Jehovah.[6] A number of regulations indicate that the priests are to be in a condition of peculiar holiness. Their food is to consist of holy things, *i.e.* things devoted to God.[7]

[1] Deut. xviii. 5.
[2] Num. xvi. 5; xvii. 5 ff.
[3] Ex. xiii. 2; Num. iii. 13; viii. 17; xviii. 15.
[4] Num. iii. 12, 41, 45; viii. 16, 18.
[5] Num. viii. 14.
[6] Ex. xxix. 1–37; xl. 12–15; Lev. viii.
[7] Lev. vi. 16 ff.; vii. 6; x. 12 ff.; etc.

They must be free from every physical defect,[1] must not marry a woman who has been debauched, profaned, or divorced,[2] must abstain from all mutilation of their bodies,[3] and can defile themselves by mourning only in exceptional cases.[4] During the performance of their functions especially, they must keep themselves Levitically perfectly clean,[5] and abstain from all intoxicating drinks.[6] Even the members of their families must be clean; if the daughter of a priest becomes a harlot she must be burned.[7] The high-priest in whom the priesthood reaches its culmination, and finds its most perfect expression, represents at the same time the twelve tribes of Israel before God.[8] Thus when he commits a sin all the people are guilty.[9] He must receive a separate consecration,[10] and wear garments which by their magnificence help to enhance the splendor of his appearance.[11] He must keep himself more strictly clean than the other priests, never wearing mourning, nor marrying any but a virgin.[12] On account of this peculiar holiness he may enter once a year into the holy of holies, for the sake of making atonement for the whole people.[13] When he is clothed in his sacerdotal ornaments he wears on his forehead this inscription: "Holiness to Jehovah,"[14] which denotes the superior sanctity with which he must be clothed in order to worthily represent the people before the holy God, and the holiness required by this God of the entire people.[15]

[1] Lev. xxi. 16 ff. [2] Lev. xxi. 7; comp. Ezek. xliv. 22. [3] Lev. xxi. 5.
[4] Lev. x. 6; xxi. 1–4; comp. Ezek. xliv. 25.
[5] Lev. xxii. 1–9. [6] Lev. x. 8–10. [7] Lev. xxi. 9.
[8] Ex. xxviii. 9–12, 21 ff., 29, 36–38. [9] Lev. iv. 3.
[10] Lev. viii. [11] Ex. xxviii. 2 ff. [12] Lev. xxi. 10–15.
[13] Lev. xvi. [14] Ex. xxviii. 36 ff. [15] Lev. xi. 44.

Though all these regulations are found only in document C, we must not conclude that they were all so many innovations. If we omit details, and grasp the essence of these regulations, we surely find in them the expression of the idea that was always connected with the priesthood in Israel, *viz.* that it was peculiarly holy, and that in consequence it enjoyed the privilege of approaching God, which the laity did not possess. We have seen that, in ancient times, this sacerdotal prerogative was but imperfectly developed in Israel; but that it continually grew and reached its apogee after the Exile; and that it finds its legal sanction in document C.

### III. *Religious Festivals.*

1. *The Sabbath.* — Originally the religious festivals in Israel were of a very simple character; they were chiefly related to nature and agriculture; but in time this simplicity was lost, giving place to more theocratic conceptions and more Levitical practices. We have already been able to show to some extent that this was the case; we shall here make it more decidedly apparent. The institution and the celebration of the Sabbath, as they were conceived by Judaism, furnish at once new proof of it.

We have seen that the humanitarian object of the Sabbath, the rest to be granted to everybody on this day, is the one most emphasized in the early documents. Yet the day had, from the start, a religious character. This appears from the decalogue, where we read:

"The seventh day is a Sabbath to Jehovah, thy God."[1] Document C says expressly, only reproducing, however, the thought of the decalogue, that the Sabbath is a day consecrated to Jehovah.[2] The decalogue says further that the Sabbath should be sanctified, set apart, *i.e.* distinguished from the other days.[3] Document C declares, finally, that it must be for Israel a holy thing.[4] Thus the Sabbath must be a day distinct from the other days, and consecrated to Jehovah. Israel belongs to Jehovah; they are his property, they must give to him their life and their time. But, since the exigencies of ordinary life do not allow them to consecrate all the days to their God, they must consecrate to him at least one day of each week. The Sabbath, by its frequent recurrence, constantly reminds Israel that they belong, that they are entirely consecrated, to the God of the covenant.[5]

Ezekiel adds to this conception of the Sabbath a new element, which is reproduced in document C, *viz.* that the Sabbath is a token between Jehovah and his people, a token that Jehovah is the God of his people, and that he sanctifies them, *i.e.* sets them apart that he may make them his peculiar people.[6] In this way the Sabbath is brought into intimate relation with the fundamental thought of the religion of Israel; it becomes the token of the covenant between Jehovah and Israel.[7]

Though the early prophets speak little of the Sabbath,

[1] Ex. xx. 10; Deut. v. 14.
[2] Ex. xxxi. 15.
[3] Ex. xx. 8; Deut. v. 12.
[4] Ex. xxxi. 14.
[5] Dillmann on Ex. xx. 9 f.; Riehm, *Handwörterbuch*, p. 1309; [Smith, *Dictionary*, art. *Sabbath*].
[6] Ezek. xx. 12, 20; Ex. xxxi. 13, 17.
[7] Ex. xxxi. 16.

and attach no great importance to the celebration of feast-days in general,[1] it is otherwise in the prophets of the Exile, who strictly enjoin the celebration of the Sabbath, and severely reprove transgressors of this divine ordinance.[2] In this respect, as in so many others, the formalistic tendency gained ground at the time of the Exile, even among the prophets, and afterwards completely got the upper hand. Document C prohibits even the most indispensable household employments on the Sabbath,[3] though there is no trace of such strictness in the oldest documents, and it pronounces the penalty of death upon those who do any work on this day.[4] It represents the Sabbath as a holiday from primitive times, and as the fundamental religious festival, making its institution date from the creation.[5] According to the passages cited, the Sabbath derived its origin from the rest that God took on the seventh day, after having created in six days the heavens and the earth. But this reason for the celebration of the Sabbath itself presupposes the idea of the Sabbath; it dates from a time more recent than the institution of the Sabbath.[6] Wellhausen remarks that it would not be possible to apply to the Sabbath, as document C conceives it, the words of Jesus, that the Sabbath was made for man, that it is rather a statute asserting itself with the severity of a natural law, which finds in itself the reason for its existence, and to which God himself must submit.[7]

[1] Hos. ii. 11; i. 13.

[2] Jer. xvii. 21–27; Ezek. xx. 12 f., 20 f., 24; xxii. 8, 26; xliv. 24; Isa. lvi. 2; lviii. 13; lxvi. 23.

[3] Ex. xvi. 23; xxxv. 2.

[4] Ex. xxxi. 14 f.; xxxv. 2; Num. xv. 32–36.

[5] Gen. ii. 2 f.; Ex. xxxi. 17; xx. 11.

[6] Dillmann on Ex. xx. 11.

[7] *History*, p. 115.

It appears that even anciently sacrifices were offered, and people gathered in religious assemblies on the Sabbath day,[1] although the old documents hardly speak of it. Ezekiel, on the contrary, gives us to understand that sacrifices must be offered on this day.[2] Document C describes the character of these sacrifices;[3] it also ordains that the shewbread be renewed on this day,[4] and a holy convocation gathered.[5] Thus we see that the Sabbath gradually lost its primitive character, and took a more Levitical color. When Leviticus, in the last passage cited, seems to require cessation from labor on the Sabbath day, that there may be leisure for worship and religious edification, this is another new view, a view too spiritual for remote antiquity, one that can only have been formed at a comparatively recent date.[6]

The Chronicler supposes that the legislation of document C was known and observed from the remotest antiquity.[7] Nehemiah was obliged to take energetic measures to secure the observance of the Sabbath, for it was violated in the grossest fashion.[8] In the time of the Maccabees the Jews, on one occasion, allowed themselves, with their wives and children, to be massacred rather than take arms on the Sabbath; but after this first sad experience they decided not to do so in the future.[9] "Based on the sacerdotal legislation, the celebration of the Sabbath in the midst of Judaism was logically developed, and continually approximated to

[1] Isa. i. 13. [2] xlv. 17. [3] Num. xxviii. 9 f. [4] Lev. xxiv. 5–8.
[5] Lev. xxiii. 3. [6] Dillmann on Ex. xx. 9 f.
[7] 1 Chron. xxiii. 31; 2 Chron. ii. 4; viii. 13; xxxi. 3; Neh. x. 33.
[8] Neh. xiii. 15-22. [9] 1 Macc. ii. 32–41; ix. 43 ff.

the ideal of absolute rest; so that the most rigid party among the Pharisees thought the entire week necessary to preparation for the holy day, and that, if possible, the half of human life was to be devoted to it. 'From Sunday onward think of the Sabbath,' says Shammai." [1]

2. *The Sabbatical Year.* — Thus far we have not spoken of the sabbatical year, though it is mentioned even in document A. But since, outside of some legal passages, it does not appear in the early history of Israel, it may be concluded that it did not play an important part.

Document A confines itself to saying that every seven years the land shall remain fallow, that the spontaneous product of the fields shall be left to the poor and to the animals, and that it shall be so even with the vine and the olive.[2] The sabbatical year, then, has here an essentially humanitarian character, like the weekly Sabbath. In Deuteronomy it preserves this character though it is presented in a new light. It there appears as a year of release, in which Israelitish debtors shall not be required to pay their debts.[3] Moreover, during the feast of tabernacles of this year, the law shall be read to all Israel gathered at the sanctuary.[4] For Ezekiel also this year is chiefly a year of release.[5]

Document C takes exactly the same view of the sabbatical year as of the weekly Sabbath. Every seven years the country must rest, that this may be a Sabbath to Jehovah.[6] The fields are not to be sowed, and the

[1] Wellhausen, *History*, p. 116.
[2] Ex. xxiii. 10 f.
[3] Deut. xv. 1 ff.
[4] Deut. xxxi. 10 f.
[5] xlvi. 17.
[6] Lev. xxv. 2 ff.

vine is not to be pruned, the spontaneous products are not to be harvested, but they are to be gathered as there is need of them.[1] The product of the soil is therefore no longer left to the poor and the beasts of the field, as document A prescribes; the owner is himself authorized to harvest for his own support and the support of his house, what the soil spontaneously produces. In order to induce the people to observe this law Jehovah promises to grant a particularly abundant harvest the sixth year.[2] The idea of the weekly Sabbath then is here extended to an entire year, and to the soil of the whole country, which is to celebrate a Sabbath in honor of Jehovah, the real owner of the soil, who has given it to Israel.[3]

This thought, that the land of Canaan belongs to Jehovah,[4] who gives it to his people,[5] always existed in Israel; but the institution of the sabbatical year, as it is represented in document C, on the basis of this thought, seems to be of recent date. We see even from this document as well as others, that before the Exile, the sabbatical year was not observed in conformity with these regulations.[6] Riehm declares that in reality it was impossible to observe it thus; that, moreover, in the legislation of document A, it is presented in another and more reasonable form; that there the command is not that all the Israelitish lands shall remain fallow the same year, but only that each field shall be so treated once in seven years, so that thus they could

[1] Lev. xxv. 3–7. [2] Lev. xxv. 18–22. [3] Lev. xxv. 2, 23.

[4] Hos. ix. 3; Josh. xxii. 19; Jer. ii. 7; Ps. x. 16.

[5] Gen. xv. 18–21; xxvi. 3 f.; Ex. xxiii. 20–31; Lev. xiv. 34; xx. 24; xxiii. 10; Num. xiii. 2; Ps. cxxxv. 12.

[6] Lev. xxvi. 34 f., 43; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21.

be allowed to rest successively instead of simultaneously.[1] Reuss and Wellhausen take the same view of the matter.[2]

We know also that, in the time of Nehemiah, it was agreed to observe this year as a year of release,[3] and that in the days of the Maccabees, it was observed as a sabbatical year, but not without danger of scarcity.[4]

3. *The Year of Jubilee.* — The year of jubilee, of which mention is made in document C, is very analogous to the sabbatical year. It is only the development, and as it were complement, of the latter. It is in reality a sabbatical year, which, however, occurs only every fifty years, after every seventh sabbatical year.[5] It is, besides, a year of liberty, of release, a year when every one recovers possession of his own estate, and returns to his own family.[6] In the year of jubilee, in fact, all alienated property must be restored to the original owner,[7] and every Israelite, whom poverty has reduced to servitude, must regain his liberty.[8] What is the reason for this twofold requirement?

Jehovah is the real owner of the country, and the Israelites are with him as strangers and guests.[9] None of them has the right to alienate what he has received from his God; he can sell only the usufruct, and that only until the year of jubilee, when all property returns to its lawful owner. But if Jehovah is sole proprietor of the land of Canaan, he is also the sole master of the Israelites; they became his servants from the day when

[1] *Handwörterbuch*, pp. 1313 ff.
[2] Reuss, *Hist. Sainte*, I. p. 176; Wellhausen, *History*, pp. 116 ff.
[3] Neh. x. 31. [4] 1 Macc. vi. 49, 53. [5] Lev. xxv. 8 f., 11 f.
[6] Lev. xxv. 10. [7] Lev. xxv. 14–17, 23–24. [8] Lev. xxv. 39–55.
[9] Lev. xxv. 23.

he brought them forth from the land of Egypt.[1] They can therefore no longer be the slaves of any one; they can only, in case of necessity, make themselves hirelings until the year of jubilee, when they will once more recover their liberty.

This year must be sanctified by the Israelites or be holy for them,[2] *i.e.* it must be distinguished from the other years as a year apart, having a sacred character.

We nowhere find that the year of jubilee was celebrated. This fact is easy to understand. It would have been necessary to leave the fields fallow two consecutive years, since the year of jubilee must always follow a sabbatical year. But it was difficult to observe even the latter. How could the other be celebrated after it? Here, as elsewhere, appears the theoretical tendency of document C. A theory was formed without any anxiety about the facts, the practical life. The systemizing spirit is allowed free rein, without regard to what is humanly possible.

4. *The New Moon.* — We know that, from early times, the new moon was a holiday in Israel. Document C presupposes the existence of it (and this is the case wherever there is reference to it throughout the Old Testament); it does not speak of its institution as it does of that of most of the other Israelitish festivals. It mentions this festival only to ordain that its solemnity shall be enhanced by the sound of the trumpet,[3] and to describe the sacrifices that must be offered when it occurs.[4] The Chronicler speaks of it in the same way.[5]

[1] Lev. xxv. 42, 55.
[2] Lev. xxv. 10–12.
[3] Num. x. 10.
[4] Num. xxviii. 11–15.
[5] 1 Chron. xxiii. 31; 2 Chron. ii. 4; viii. 13; xxxi. 3; Neh. x. 33.

Document C, however, institutes a festival for the first day of the seventh month, with directions to celebrate it more solemnly than the other new moons, as a great feast-day on which there shall be a summons by trumpets, a holy convocation, and special sacrifices, besides the sacrifices of the other new moons.[1]

This enhanced solemnity of the seventh new moon proves that the idea of the Sabbath is applied to the months as to the years, and that the seventh month of the year is in a sense a sabbatical month. But everything favors the belief that this festival, like the year of jubilee, is introduced into document C simply that the sabbatical system may be more complete, and may extend to the months as well as to the years and the days. In the early documents no trace of it is to be found.

5. *The Pilgrim Feasts.* — We have already, under the first period, considered the essential features of these great pilgrim feasts. It remains for us to notice here some features peculiar to the documents of our period.

*a.* Ezekiel, in his proposed legislation, speaking of the feast of the passover, describes especially the number of sacrifices that the prince is to offer every day, during the paschal week.[2] Document C gives much attention to this feast.[3] It differs in certain respects from the earliest codes. Thus it ordains that the paschal victim shall be eaten in every house, and that all shall partake of it,[4] while the older codes prescribed that the passover should be sacrificed and

[1] Lev. xxiii. 23–25; Num. xxix. 1–6.
[2] xlv. 21–24.
[3] Ex. xii. 1–20, 43–49; Lev. xxiii. 5 ff.; Num. ix. 1 ff.; xxviii. 16–25.
[4] Ex. xii. 3 ff., 46.

eaten at the sanctuary, whither only the male and adult Israelites resorted. It also requires that the flesh of the paschal victim be roasted and not boiled,[1] that not only the seventh but also the first day be a holiday,[2] and that sacrifices be offered every day during the paschal week;[3] this last feature we found only in Ezekiel. It declares that the stranger who wishes to partake of the passover must allow himself to be circumcised,[4] and that every Israelite is obliged to celebrate it every year; that he who neglects to do so shall be punished with death, and that he who is prevented from celebrating it at the date fixed must celebrate it a month later.[5]

Here again we can trace the influence of document C upon the author of Chronicles. It is only necessary to compare 2 Kings xxiii. 21 ff. with 2 Chron. xxxv. Both passages speak of the celebration of the passover under Josiah, as it had not been celebrated from time immemorial. But the second account differs from the first, in that it introduces all sorts of details, for the purpose of representing this celebration in a way to make it conform to the regulations of document C. On one point, however, the author seeks to reconcile this latter with Deuteronomy. While, according to the one, the flesh of the paschal victim is to be roasted and according to the other it is to be boiled, the Chronicler causes to be prepared for the passover both roasted and boiled meats.[6]

*b.* Respecting the feast of weeks it is in order to

[1] Ex. xii. 8 f.
[2] Ex. xii. 12, 16; Lev. xxiii. 7 f.; Num. xxviii. 18, 25.
[3] Num. xxviii. 19–24. [4] Ex. xii. 44–48. [5] Num. ix. 10–13.
[6] 2 Chron. xxxv. 13.

make a preliminary observation on the name that it bears in the three principal documents of the Pentateuch,[1] and on the number of weeks, seven, that must separate it from the feast of the passover.[2] Must we not conclude from this name and number that this feast had an astronomical, before it took an agricultural, character, and that it was first the feast of the seven weeks before becoming the feast of the end of the harvest, or the day of the first-fruits?[3] This period of seven weeks recalls, moreover, the feast of the seventh new moon, the sabbatical year, and the year of jubilee. And it is clear that the same system that underlies the week of seven days with its Sabbath is extended to all the other divisions of time: the seventh day of the week is the Sabbath, the seventh week counting from the passover is closed by the feast of weeks, the seventh new moon is celebrated in a peculiarly solemn way, the seventh year is a sabbatical year, and finally, after seven sabbatical years, occurs the year of jubilee; then the cycle is complete.

Beyond these general observations we have little to say of the feast in question, which, moreover, never had the importance of the other two pilgrim feasts. Thus the prophet Ezekiel does not even mention it in his proposed Levitical legislation, complete as that is. And in the earliest literature there is never any reference to it outside of the legal passages of documents A and B.

The few new points on this subject, contained in document C, are the following: The feast of weeks shall

[1] Ex. xxxiv. 22; Deut. xvi. 10, 16; Num. xxviii. 26.

[2] Deut. xvi. 9 f.; Lev. xxiii. 15 f. [3] Num. xxviii. 26.

be consecrated to rest, and on this day there shall be a holy convocation;[1] the offerings to be made, far from being left to the inclination of each worshipper, or proportioned to the divine blessing received, as in Deuteronomy, are strictly regulated;[2] it is prescribed among other things that an expiatory sacrifice shall be offered, and certain fixed contributions paid to the priests,[3] while Deuteronomy makes this feast a joyful feast and urges that the Levites be invited to the public meal with the poor; the special offering at this feast, which best expresses its agricultural character, is the offering of two loaves.[4]

*c.* According to the early documents, the date of the feast of tabernacles had to be regulated solely by the autumn harvests, which vary from one year to another. Ezekiel is the first to mention the fifteenth day of the seventh month as a fixed date for this feast; he maintains the duration of the feast at seven days, but he prescribes expiatory sacrifices, which hardly agree with the joyous character that this feast seems always to have had before the Exile.[5]

Document C here introduces innovations more numerous and more important. According to it the feast of tabernacles must last eight days instead of seven, and on the first as well as the last day there must be a holy convocation and a day of rest.[6] More than this, document C inclines to rob this feast of its agricultural character, and impress upon it a theocratic one. It

[1] Lev. xxiii. 21; Num. xxviii. 26.
[2] Lev. xxiii. 16 ff.; Num. xxviii. 26 ff.
[3] Lev. xxiii. 19 f.; Num. xxviii. 30.
[4] Lev. xxiii. 17.
[5] Ezek. xlv. 25.
[6] Lev. xxiii. 33–36, 39 ff.

ordains that it be celebrated forever in honor of Jehovah, in order that all future generations may know that he caused the children of Israel to dwell in tents after having freed them from the land of Egypt.[1] But the booths of branches, which are evidently of rural character, thus lose their primitive significance. We see that the benefits of nature, which so deeply impressed the ancient Israelites, no longer had the same value for the Jews, who more highly prized theocratic advantages. Document C prescribes that at this feast a much larger number of sacrifices be offered than at the others; moreover, according to its custom, it regulates everything, and leaves nothing to the inclination of the individual.[2] In the time of Ezra these regulations began to be observed, but it was well known that previously this feast had not been celebrated in the same manner.[3]

6. *The Day of Atonement.* — The day of atonement seems to be an innovation of document C. There is not to be found the slightest trace of it in earlier documents. Ezekiel offers at most a few hints that may have suggested such a festival.[4] The need of celebrating a great day of fasting and atonement was undoubtedly suggested by the catastrophe of the Exile, which made the feeling of the guilt of the entire people weigh heavily upon the conscience, and led, as we have seen, to the institution of several days of fasting.

The day of atonement, or of the great propitiation, must be the tenth day of the seventh month, and a day of rest and fasting; it must be celebrated by a holy

[1] Lev. xxiii. 41–43.
[2] Num. xxix. 12–39.
[3] Ezra iii. 4; Neh. viii. 13–18.
[4] xlv. 18–20.

convocation, and a series of sacrifices.[1] It should be observed that this is the only occasion for which the law ordains fasting, and here it is undoubtedly meant to be an expression of the feelings of contrition and humility that should fill the heart on that day. The special regulations for this festival are enumerated at length in the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus which treats especially of this subject. We there learn that on the day of atonement the high-priest, in fulfilling his functions, must put on, not his ornaments, but a simple robe of linen, as a sign of humiliation, and this, after having taken a bath in token of purification; that he must offer an expiatory sacrifice for himself and his house, and another for the people, sprinkling some of the blood of each of the victims before the mercy seat in the holy of holies, and putting their sins upon the scapegoat, that it may bear them into the desert; that he must make atonement even for the sanctuary and the altar, on account of the uncleanness of the children of Israel. This day is therefore essentially a day of general and complete purification, on which Israel must be purified from all their sins and all their stains.[2] This purification, as we have just seen, must be effected by humiliation and atonement.

Israel must be pure and holy to enjoy the covenant with Jehovah, the pure and holy God. When their holiness is sullied it must be restored. For individual stains and sins the law prescribes special expiatory and purifying processes. But these processes do not suffice to restore the entire people to purity and holi-

[1] Lev. xvi. 29, 31 ; xxiii. 26-32 ; Num. xxix. 7–11.
[2] Lev. xvi. 16, 19–21, 30, 34.

ness. This end is only attained by the great day of atonement. This festival, annually repeated, restores every year the holiness of Israel, and thus renders possible the maintenance of their covenant with the holy God. That the purification may be complete the high-priest must first purify himself, and then the entire priesthood, the people, and even the sanctuary with the altar. The people must participate in the act of purification by observing a day of rest and fasting. This expiatory festival, which was celebrated a few days before the feast of tabernacles, the last of the annual festivals, became as it were a day of preparation for this holy week, purifying Israel from their sins that they might afterward give themselves to rejoicing.[1]

7. *The Feast of Purim.* — According to Esther ix. 17–32, the feast of purim was instituted in the days of Ahasuerus by Mordecai, in memory of the defeat that Haman suffered in his murderous plans against the Jews, and the victory that the latter won over their enemies. But it is now generally admitted that the narrative of the book of Esther is not historical. And since we have no other means of discovering the actual origin of this festival, it remains surrounded with great obscurity. If there is one thing clearer than another it is that this has nothing in common with the other Israelitish festivals. It is not brought into relation with the sanctuary, to say nothing of God, whose name even does not once appear in the book in question.

[1] *Bibel-Lexikon*, V. p. 599 ; [Ewald, *Antiquities*, p. 361].

### IV. *Religious Rites.*

We shall not here speak again of all the religious ceremonies, to which reference was made in the first period, for the simple reason that we have exhausted all that concerns most of them. But we must return to the subject of sacrifices, on which there remains a number of observations to be made.

We have seen that, according to document A, the practice of making sacrifices is as old as humanity. Document C, on the contrary, represents matters in such a way as to induce the belief that Moses first instituted sacrifices and Israelitish worship in general. In the earlier history, in fact, it never speaks of sacrifices, and does not allow us to suppose that they were offered. This is but one instance of a divergence of which a more striking example must here be noticed.

Until toward the Exile the important thing in Israel was that the sacrifices be offered to Jehovah, and not to other gods; the ceremony in itself considered, and the persons fulfilling the sacerdotal functions when sacrifices were offered, were secondary matters. Document C, on the contrary, presents an entirely different view of the subject. All that concerns worship is there regulated in the strictest and minutest manner, and all the acts of worship must be performed in harmony with these regulations. The sons of Aaron alone, after having received the required consecration, have the right to offer sacrifices, and to offer them according to the lawful ritual. Any transgression of these ritualistic laws is punishable with death. According to this document, therefore, it is not to be supposed that the

patriarchs, those men of God, offered sacrifices at will, as document A narrates; it is not to be supposed that faithful Israelites or their ancestors performed religious rites that were not in strict conformity to the regulations of the Mosaic and divine law. This is the reason why it does not describe the patriarchs as performing religious rites such as sacrifices.

In its legal portion this document gives much space to sacrifices. Besides the numerous passages that regulate the special ones, seven chapters, Lev. i.–vii., are exclusively devoted to this subject. There is mention of burnt-offerings, which were entirely consumed on the altar, and which therefore best express the idea of entire consecration to God;[1] of bloodless sacrifices, of which only a part was burned on the altar, while the rest fell to the priests;[2] of peace-offerings or thank-offerings, of which certain portions were consumed on the altar, while others fell to the priests, or were eaten by those who offered them;[3] finally, of two kinds of expiatory sacrifices, the blood from which was used in making atonement, and the fat was burned on the altar, while the flesh, in certain cases, was burned outside the camp, and in other cases was used as food by the priests.[4]

Before the Exile only the first three kinds of sacrifices were known; at least there is never in the old documents any reference to a special class of expiatory sacrifices. Ezekiel is the first to make mention of them.[5] There is only one older passage that speaks, not of an expiatory sacrifice, but of a guilt-offering, or a

[1] i.; vi. 8 ff. [2] ii.; vi. 14 ff. [3] iii.; vii. 11 ff.
[4] iv. f.; vi. 24 ff.; vii. 1 ff.
[5] xl. 39; xlii. 13; xliii. 19 ff.; xliv. 29; xlv. 15, 17 ff.; xlvi. 20.

species of fine that the Philistines believed themselves bound to pay to the God of Israel, when restoring the ark of the covenant, that they might stop the plagues that it had brought upon them.[1] In another passage, which, however, is perhaps not older than the Exile, mention is also made of guilt money and sin money, which are to fall to the priests, *i.e.* fines to be paid to the priests, as reparation for injustice committed, and which are regarded as offerings made to Jehovah.[2] In Ezekiel, on the contrary, there is reference to veritable sin and guilt offerings, such as we see in document C.[3] Though special names to designate the expiatory sacrifice are only found from the Exile onward, and they were not made a separate class until then, this does not mean that these sacrifices were not known before that time. The Israelites, like the other peoples, certainly from remote antiquity offered expiatory sacrifices; but in this case they employed burnt-offerings and thank-offerings.[4] Even in document C are found proofs that the burnt-offering might also serve as an expiatory sacrifice.[5]

## § 32. FORGIVENESS AND ATONEMENT.

This is the proper place to consider more particularly the two subjects, forgiveness and atonement, the latter of which, especially, attained in this period alone its complete development.

[1] 1 Sam. vi. 3–8. [2] 2 Kings xii. 16; comp. Num. v. 5–10.

[3] Lev. iv. f.; vi. 17 – vii. 7.

[4] Gen. viii. 20; Ex. xx. 24; xxiv. 5; Jud. xx. 26; xxi. 3 f.; 1 Sam. xiii. 9; 2 Sam. xxiv. 18–25; Job i. 5; xlii. 8; Mic. vi. 6 f.; Ezra xlv. 15, 17. [5] Lev. i. 4; xiv. 20; xvi. 24.

According to the Old Testament there are mortal sins, that can neither be forgiven nor expiated,[1] that must be punished by death. In the various codes of the Pentateuch a large number of passages pronounce the sentence of death upon the guilty.[2] Now these sentences should not be regarded simply from the juridical standpoint; it is Jehovah who pronounces them, or who causes them to be pronounced and executed, that he may extirpate from the midst of his people and exclude from his covenant those who have become guilty of unpardonable sins. According to Num. xv. 27–31, involuntary sins may be expiated and pardoned, but sins committed with a high hand, *i.e.* intentionally, deliberately, defiantly, and contemptuously,[3] do not obtain forgiveness; they must be punished by death. This distinction, however, is found only in document C;[4] elsewhere, on the contrary, we see that forgiveness is granted even to sins committed in a perfectly conscious condition.

Often, in fact, the people Israel were unworthy of forgiveness. Jehovah forgave them then for his own sake, and for the sake of his name, to sanctify, glorify his name among the heathen nations, that it might not be exposed to their scoffs, and allowed to be profaned;[5]

[1] Ex. xxxii. 30–35; 1 Sam. iii. 14.

[2] Gen. xvii. 14; Ex. xii. 15, 19; xxxi. 14 f.; xxxv. 2; Lev. vii. 20 ff.; xvii. 4; xxiii. 29; etc.

[3] Comp. Num. xxxiii. 3; Ex. xiv. 8.

[4] Lev. iv. 2 ff., 13 ff., 22 ff., 27 ff.; v. 15 ff.; xxii. 14; Num. xv. 22 ff.; xxxv. 11, 15, 22 ff.; Josh. xx. 3 ff., 9.

[5] Num. xiv. 13 ff.; Deut. ix. 24 ff.; Jer. xiv. 20 f.; Ezek. xx. 8 f., 13 f., 21 f., 43 f.; xxxvi. 17 ff., 22 ff.; Isa. xliii. 25; xlviii. 9–11; Ps. lxxix. 9 f.

or perhaps for the sake of Zion and Jerusalem, chosen by Jehovah as a place for his name;[1] or again perhaps on account of the fathers, of the covenant made with them, and the promises made to them under oath;[2] finally, on account of the intercession or the faithfulness of genuine servants of God.[3] All this amounts to saying that Jehovah grants to his people unmerited forgiveness, gratuitous forgiveness.

From ancient times forgiveness is placed in close relation with atonement. But this latter, in Judaism, is understood otherwise than in Hebraism, and the terms used to denote it in the Old Testament have a signification different from that which we attach to the word *atone*.

The Hebrew terms that are generally rendered by this English word or its derivatives come from the root *kaphar*, which means *cover*. Thus, according to Gen. xxxii. 20, Jacob seeks to cover the face of Esau with presents, that the latter may not see his fault, and that he himself may look his brother in the face without further fear of his anger. When the people Israel have offended Jehovah by the worship of the golden calf, Moses seeks to cover the sin of the people by entreating the forgiveness of God.[4] According to Deut. xxxii. 43, Jehovah covers his country and his people by avenging the blood of his servants, and avenging himself on

[1] 1 Kings xi. 13, 32, 36; xiv. 21.

[2] Ex. xxxii. 13 f.; Lev. xxvi. 40–45; Deut. ix. 27; 1 Kings xi. 13, 32, 34, 36; xv. 3–5; 2 Kings viii. 18 f.; xiii. 23; xix. 34; xx. 6.

[3] Gen. xviii. 26 ff.; xx. 7; Ex. xxxii. 11–14; Num. xiv. 13–20; Deut. ix. 25 ff.; 1 Sam. vii. 5; Job xlii. 8 f.; Ps. cvi. 23; Jer. v. 1; Ezek. xxii. 30; Isa. liii.; lxv. 8.

[4] Ex. xxxii. 30.

his adversaries.[1] God declares on his oath that the sin of Eli shall never be covered by sacrifices.[2] The term in question also designates the reparation that David makes to the Gibeonites, for the injury done them by Saul.[3] This reparation is at the same time a satisfaction rendered to Jehovah, who has sent upon his people famine in punishment of this crime. It consists in delivering to the Gibeonites seven sons of Saul, that they may be hanged before Jehovah at Gibeah.[4] When Isaiah, at the time of his call, thinks himself undone, because he, though unclean, has seen Jehovah, a seraph touches his lip with a glowing stone taken from the altar of the sanctuary, and says to him: "Thy iniquity is taken away, and thy sin is covered."[5] Thenceforward the prophet has nothing to fear from the holy presence of God. In another series of passages, it is generally God who covers the sin of men, clearly as not taking account of it, as forgiving it.[6] In Prov. xvi. 6 man is regarded as himself covering sin by virtue, as for example, a little farther on in verse 14, the wise man is said to cover the wrath of the king, *i.e.* appease it. The verb *kasah*, which evidently means *cover*, is used in the same sense as *kaphar*, but more rarely.[7]

In the foregoing it is difficult to find a distinct theory on the subject under discussion. What appears most clearly is that sin needs to be covered before the holy

[1] Riehm, *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1877, p. 24; [Schultz, I. pp. 397 f.].
[2] 1 Sam. iii. 14. [3] 2 Sam. xxi. 3.
[4] 2 Sam. xxi. 1–6. [5] Isa. vi. 5–7.
[6] Deut. xxi. 8; Jer. xviii. 23; Ezek. xvi. 63; 2 Chron. xxx. 18; Ps. lxv. 3; lxxviii. 38; lxxix. 9; comp. Isa. xxii. 14; xxvii. 9; Dan. ix. 24. [7] Prov. x. 12; xvii. 9; Neh. iv. 5; Ps. xxxii. 1; lxxxv. 2.

God, that God usually covers it himself, and that the intercession of a man of God, the offering of sacrifices, repentance, and faithfulness, are the means of covering it. With the appearance of the two Levitical theorists, Ezekiel and the author of document C, the subject is presented in a more uniform manner, and otherwise than in the early documents. According to them, in fact, it is persons, unclean or unholy souls, not sin, that need to be covered; it is not God that covers them, but the priesthood; and the means used are the sacred rites, chiefly sacrifices, and especially sin and guilt offerings.[1] There is even reference to the covering of things, especially sacred objects, to make them clean, holy;[2] thus the land that has been polluted by the blood of a person intentionally slain can be covered only by the blood of the murderer.[3]

All this proves that the word *atone*, by which the verb *kaphar* is usually rendered, distorts the primitive and characteristic idea that it is intended to express. This is best shown by the fact that document C, which gave to this idea the importance that was afterwards attributed to it, like Ezekiel, speaks of objects that must be covered. The translators are therefore obliged, in conformity with established usage, to speak of an altar, a sanctuary, etc., for which atonement must be

[1] Ezek. xlv. 15, 17; Ex. xxix. 33, 36; xxx. 10–16; Lev. i. 4; iv. 20 ff.; v. 6 ff.; vi. 30; vii. 7; viii. 34; ix. 7 f.; x. 17; xii. 7 f.; xiv. 18–21, 29–31, 52 f.; xv. 15, 30; xvi. 6 ff.; xvii. 11; xix. 22; xxiii. 27 f.; Num. v. 8; vi. 11; viii. 12 ff.; xv. 25, 28; xvi. 46 f.; xxv. 13; xxviii. 22, 30; xxix. 5, 11; xxxi. 50; 1 Chron. vi. 49; 2 Chron. xxix. 24; xxx. 18.

[2] Ezek. xliii. 20, 26; xlv. 18–20; Ex. xxix. 36 f.; xxx. 10; Lev. viii. 15; xiv. 53; xvi. 16, 18, 20, 33.

[3] Num. xxxv. 33.

made, that it may be or remain consecrated to Jehovah. This is a false idea, and one that the Old Testament does not intend to express. What it means is that men and things, in a sinful or unclean condition, or in a profane condition, need to be clothed in moral or Levitical holiness to exist in the presence of the God of holiness, to be pleasing to him, or consecrated to his service.

Though the Old Testament speaks of various means of atonement, though it represents certain sacrifices as means of expiation *par excellence*, as means of covering the sins of men before the holy God, it does not explain just how atonement is effected. Too often, in seeking a solution of this question, almost exclusive attention has been paid to Lev. xvii. 11, and it has been concluded that there can be no atonement and forgiveness without the shedding of blood.[1] But the passage is not so absolute. It says, indeed, that blood serves the purpose of atonement; it does not say that it alone serves this purpose. And even if it did say so, we should here have only the view of document C, and not that of the Old Testament in general; for we have become acquainted with other means of expiation. But this document itself recognizes that the shedding of blood is not indispensable to atonement. It speaks of bloodless atoning sacrifices.[2] It shows that the offering of incense also effects atonement,[3] as well as the offering of money brought by each Israelite when the people are numbered.[4] Finally in atoning sacrifices all parts of the victims and all the sacrificial acts

[1] Heb. ix. 22.
[2] Lev. v. 11–13.
[3] Num. xvi. 46 f.
[4] Ex. xxx. 11–16.

contribute to atonement, for only after the performance of all these acts is it usually said that the priest shall thus make atonement for the guilty, and that they shall be forgiven.[1] The blood of the atoning victims should not, therefore, be regarded as the principal means of atonement. According to Lev. xvii. 11, it has this effect, because the blood is the seat of the soul or the life of the victim; this is the reason why it can make atonement for souls. But whence comes it that the blood is the seat of life, has this effect? The Scriptures do not say. We think that it is because, in the Old Testament, life is always regarded as the most precious and the most sacred of things.[2] The special part played by the blood in the offering of expiatory sacrifices is indicated by the peculiar way in which it is sprinkled.[3]

It has often been taught that the atoning victim was slain in the place of the sinner, that it suffered the death that the latter had deserved. But this is not so. According to the Israelitish law, the man who has deserved death is obliged to suffer it, he cannot redeem himself by any victim whatsoever. Expiatory sacrifices can only cover sins committed by inadvertence, which do not incur the penalty of death. Nor does anything in the ceremony connected with expiatory sacrifices indicate that the victims suffer death in place of the guilty. The atoning victims are slain like the others. Their slaughter is simply the means of obtaining the blood, the fat, and the flesh, each of which contributes to the sacrificial act. It is equally wrong to suppose

[1] Lev. iv. 20, 26, 35; v. 10, 13. [2] [Schultz, I. pp. 385 f.]
[3] Lev. iv. 6 f., 16–18, 25; comp. i. 5; iii. 2.

that in placing his hand upon the head of the victim the offender transfers his guilt to it. This act is prescribed for sacrifices in general, as, for example, for peace-offerings,[1] by which thanks are rendered to God.[2]

Since the atoning sacrifice, like any other sacrifice, is a *qorban*, an offering,[3] we must come to the conclusion that it is an offering made to God by an offender, to make amends for a reparable transgression, and to obtain forgiveness for it. It is in reality a means of grace, a means offered by Jehovah to members of his people who have inadvertently sinned against him, by which they may be restored to favor before him, be reconciled to him, and thus continue to enjoy the covenant with him.

## § 33. ETHICAL LIFE.

### I. *Pharisaism.*

Since worship, the external side of religion, played a preponderant part in Judaism, the internal, the moral and religious, life necessarily had to suffer. An exaggerated value attributed to external worship, in fact, leads man to believe that the strict performance of religious ceremonies constitutes the prime duty of life, that this is the sum total of religion, and even morality. The Jews were the more liable to fall into this error, since, for them, as for the Hebrews, morality was essentially religious, inseparable from religion. In strict devotion to the latter they believed that they faithfully fulfilled all their duties.

[1] Lev. iii. [2] Lev. vii. 11 ff. [3] Lev. iv. 23, 28, 32; v. 11.

When religion is purely legal and formalistic, as was that of the Jews, it is, moreover, easier to meet its demands than when it consists of holiness of heart and life. In the latter case there is always something lacking even in the best. Legality is easier of attainment than genuine piety and morality. Formalism and legalism, therefore, necessarily issue in pride. They engender the doctrine of the merit of works, of salvation by one's own righteousness. They produce contempt for all who do not observe, or do not strictly enough observe, the elaborate and often wearisome rites of religion.

All this we learn from Pharisaism, as it presents itself to us in the New Testament, whence we see that it was not merely a sect or a tendency in the midst of Judaism, but the dominant tendency, so that Judaism and Pharisaism finally became identical. But the Pharisaical tendency existed among the Jews before the rise of the Pharisaical party. We shall describe some of its characteristic features.

It should first of all be observed that the old covenant, with its essentially legal *régime*, develops in man the idea of his own righteousness, and largely issues in the doctrine of the merit of works. The whole Old Testament teaches that the salvation of each one depends upon his righteousness, upon the faithful observance of the commands of God, formulated by the written law or the prophets. Thus when Schultz declares that there is no self-righteousness in Israel, that there is only a righteousness given by God and springing from free grace, he does not state the matter correctly, but confounds the view of the Old Testament with that of

the New.[1] It is true that the covenant of Jehovah with his people is represented as a pure favor on the part of God. But when this grace is once granted by God and accepted by the people, God is bound by his righteousness and his faithfulness to grant his blessings to his people, as they are bound to be righteous and faithful, that they may not be punished or rejected by God. And what is true of the entire people is true also of each individual Israelite. He who does not strictly observe the commands of God cannot share in his covenant and his blessings. It is impossible to cite here all the passages that contain such a declaration, but this is not necessary for one who is acquainted with the Old Testament; it will suffice to refer to Deuteronomy and the book of Job, the worthiest productions of the early religion of Israel. The former of these books expresses the view dominant in the Old Testament in these words: "Jehovah hath commanded us to put into practice all these laws, and to fear Jehovah, our God, that we may always be happy, and that he may preserve us alive."[2] This view is also maintained against Job by his friends, when they say to him: "Doth not thy fear of God sustain thee? Is not thy hope, thy integrity?"[3] The tragical character of the book of Job arises from the fact that the traditional religion of Israel demands that the hero of the book be perfectly happy, because of his integrity and his uprightness, while, in reality, he is very unhappy. That happiness bears an exact ratio to faithfulness, was a fundamental principle in the Israelitish religion, and when facts happened to belie it, the believer, as the book of Job shows, was

[1] II. 30 f. [2] Deut. vi. 24; comp. xxx. 15 ff. [3] Job iv. 6.

thrown into great embarrassment. Take, again, the prayer of the sick Hezekiah asking God to cure him: "Jehovah! remember that I have walked before thy face in faithfulness and integrity of heart, and that I have done what is good in thy eyes!"[1] Here is an expression of the feeling that must have filled the heart of every Israelite who was, or believed himself, faithful, and that, in fact, often recurs in the Psalms, a considerable number of which date from the period before the Exile.[2]

Though the idea of the merit of works is inseparable from the essence of the religion of Israel, this idea was nevertheless destined to gain much in intensity in the midst of Judaism, when the voice of the prophets had died away, and the letter of the law, especially of the ceremonial law, had become the basis of religion. External practices always played an important part in the religion of Israel, which was far from comprehending that God is a spirit, and that he must be worshipped in spirit and in truth. But the prophets vigorously opposed the external and superficial piety of the multitude, and sought to awaken in the heart a more vital piety. After the Exile, on the contrary, prophetism disappeared, and external worship, developed under the influence of a marked predilection for it, obtained legal sanction in document C. Thenceforward formalism and legalism, so agreeable to the natural tendencies of the human heart, which seeks an easy and comfortable religion, got the upper hand and with it the claim to self-righteousness.

[1] 2 Kings xx. 3.

[2] Ps. vii. 8; xvii. 1 ff.; xviii. 20, 24; xxvi.; xxxv. 23 f.; xli. 12; xliv. 17 ff.; etc.

The example of Nehemiah, one of the fathers of Judaism, is a striking proof of this. The principal object of his efforts was to lead the people to submit to the ceremonial law. Now he imagined that he thus acquired the greatest merit. He is constantly saying: "Remember me in favor, O my God, on account of all that I have done for this people! Forget not my pious deeds!"[1] Daniel, likewise, says to King Nebuchadnezzar: "Cancel thy sins by kindnesses and thy iniquities by compassion toward the unfortunate, and thy happiness may be prolonged."[2] Finally, the book of Tobit frequently and naïvely expresses the idea of the merit of works, especially alms and other acts of charity done to the brethren.[3] It goes so far as to declare that alms deliver from death and cleanse from all sin, and that those who give alms will be blessed with long life.[4]

## II. *Exclusivism.*

Another characteristic feature of the religion of Israel, which we encounter from early times, and which takes exaggerated proportions in Judaism, is a hostile attitude toward strangers. The fundamental idea of this religion, that God has chosen Israel from among all the peoples of the earth to make them a peculiar people, must naturally give birth to national pride, though, in theory, it was admitted that this covenant was purely a divine favor. By virtue of their election, Israel believed themselves possessed of peculiar privileges and rights

[1] Neh. v. 19; xiii. 14, 22, 31. [2] iv. 27.
[3] i. 2 f., 16 ff.; ii. 2 ff., 14; iv. 7 ff., 16; xii. 8 f.; xiv. 2, 7 ff.
[4] xii. 9.

over all the other peoples. Hence the thought that they could exterminate without scruple the inhabitants of the land of Canaan, and that they must make alliance with no foreign people. This view is expressed not only in the early documents, but even in Deuteronomy.[1] In the prophetical period this exclusive tendency was modified by a higher view. The prophets express the hope of a universal salvation. In Deuteronomy we frequently find the injunction to deal kindly with the strangers who live in the midst of Israel. This breadth, the product of the prophetical spirit, could not be developed in the midst of Judaism; it was stifled, like so many other excellent elements of prophetism, until the time when the gospel revivified these germs of truth and life, and allowed them to be even more grandly developed.

The tendency of which we have just spoken manifested itself from the return of the exiles onward. The Samaritans, since they worshipped the same God as the Jews, desired to take part in the restoration of the temple. This offer of fraternal coöperation, instead of being favorably accepted, was repelled, and the Samaritans were informed that they had neither part nor right nor memorial in Jerusalem.[2] It is well known that this was the beginning of a hateful rivalry that lasted for centuries. Exaggeration of the national sentiment and the national purity was also the chief cause of the pitiless dismissal of all foreign wives, required by Ezra and Nehemiah.[3] Complete separation from strangers appears to have been an essential feature

[1] Chap. vii.
[2] Ezra iv. 2 f.; Neh. ii. 20.
[3] Ezra ix. f.; Neh. xiii. 23 ff.

of Jewish fidelity.[1] What a difference between this view and that betrayed by the book of Ruth, in which conjugal union between Israelites and Moabites appears so harmless that the author undertakes to show that one of the ancestors of David was the Moabitess, Ruth!

The national pride of the Jews finds expression in the book of Daniel. Canaan is called the most beautiful of all countries;[2] the Jews receive the extravagant title of saints of the Most-High,[3] and appear as the favorites of God;[4] finally, even the glorification of their God by the mouths of the gentiles is to serve to enhance the glory of the Jews.[5] This tendency reaches its culmination in the book of Esther. With boundless national pride is here associated a profound hatred of enemies, and an extreme pleasure in the vengeance taken upon them; the whole is crowned by a feast destined to perpetuate the memory of the massacre of their enemies. The same spirit recurs in the book of Judith. It, in fact, confesses that all means are allowable by which the Jews can destroy their enemies, and that God will grant success even to perfidious and criminal enterprises undertaken with this object;[6] it also expresses the conviction that God, on the day of judgment, will execute vengeance upon all the enemies of the Jews, sending fire and worms upon their bodies to torment them forever.[7] Sirach himself approves hatred of enemies and vengeance taken on

[1] Neh. ix. 2; x. 28, 30; xiii. 30.
[2] viii. 9; xi. 16, 41.
[3] vii. 18, 21 f., 25, 27; viii. 24; xii. 7.
[4] i. 17 ff.; ii. 25 ff., 46 ff.; iii. 30; iv. 8 f., 18; v. 11, 14, 29; vi. 28.
[5] ii. 47; iii. 26, 28 f.; iv. 1–3, 34–37; vi. 20, 25–27.
[6] Chaps. viii. ff.
[7] xvi. 17.

them.[1] A considerable number of psalms contain undisguised expressions of the same sentiments, for example this prayer to God: "Shed thy fury upon the nations that know not thee, and upon the kingdoms that call not upon thy name."[2] These are sentiments entirely opposed to those of most of the prophets, who wished and hoped that Jehovah would make his name known to all nations. Elsewhere a psalmist cries: "Daughter of Babylon, the wasted, happy he who repayeth thee in kind the evil that thou hast done us! Happy he who seizeth thy children, and dasheth them upon the rock!"[3] Other psalms give utterance to the same spirit of hatred and vengeance against enemies, against strangers.[4]

### III. *Scepticism.*

The formalism and the narrowness that we have found to have existed in the midst of Judaism prove conclusively that the religious and moral life was growing feeble. Another not less evident proof of the same fact is the scepticism that shows itself in the book of Ecclesiastes. Scepticism is very often a fruit of superficial formalism and haughty narrowness. When these two lamentable tendencies become dominant in a people, reflecting persons, who have no real piety, easily allow themselves to fall into scepticism, the distressing conviction so often repeated in Ecclesiastes: "All is vanity!"

[1] Chap. xii.; xxv. 7; xxx. 6; xxxiii. 7 ff.
[2] Ps. lxxix. 6; comp. Jer. x. 25. [3] Ps. cxxxvii. 8 f.
[4] xviii. 37 ff.; xli. 10; lv. 15; lviii. 10; lxix. 22 ff.; cix. 6 ff.

The problem of life that confronts one in the book of Job is equally prominent in Ecclesiastes. But while, in the former book, faith triumphs over doubt, without, however, solving the problem stated, in the second, it is doubt that seems to prevail over faith. The proposition that constantly recurs in Ecclesiastes is that all is vanity: toils, pleasures, wisdom, wealth, power,[1] the practice of righteousness,[2] even existence itself.[3] This scepticism is, however, not absolute. Not to speak of the close of the book,[4] of which the authenticity is not admitted by everybody, we find in it, in several passages, the expression not only of faith, but of confidence in God,[5] and the injunction to fear God,[6] on account of the judgment which no one will escape.[7] The last two verses of the book,[8] so far from being a heterogeneous addition, is, therefore, in complete accord with the rest of it.

This faith in God, in virtue and retribution, which our author seeks to retain, in spite of all the objections of reason, prevents him from falling into the abyss of impiety or despair. But this faith is not powerful enough to become truly triumphant. It is in conflict with the objections of reason from one end of the book to the other. Though the author maintains his faith to the end, the objections also retain to the end all their force. In Job we find, as a conclusion, believing resignation to the sovereign will of God; in Ecclesiastes there is hardly anything but submission to fate.

[1] i. 2, 17 f.; ii. 1, 11, 15, 19, 23, 25 f.; iii. 19; iv. 4, 7 f., 16; v. 10; vi. 9; vii. 6; xii. 10.
[2] vii. 15 f.; viii. 10, 14; ix. 1–3.
[3] ii. 17; iv. 2 f.; vii. 1.
[4] xii. 11–16.
[5] iii. 10 f., 14, 17; v. 18 ff.; vii. 13 f., 29.
[6] v. 7; vii. 18; viii. 12 f.; xii. 3.
[7] xii. 1.
[8] xii. 15 f.

This book, even more clearly than that of Job, shows the insufficiency of the religious principles of the Old Testament, the impossibility of solving with their aid the problem of life satisfactorily. It lays one's finger on the source of this insufficiency, *viz.* the want of hope, hope in the life everlasting.[1] Reuss justly says of this book: "It is the last attempt made by Hebrew philosophy to conjure doubts henceforth irresistible, to solve the problem of life without leaving the narrow circle of ancient beliefs. And this attempt, so far from succeeding, issues in the confession, as sad as it is sincere, of its own vanity, nay we should rather say, in complete bankruptcy of reason."[2]

## IV. *Wisdom.*

Pharisaism, exclusivism, scepticism, — do these three words express the entire moral and religious life of the Jews? By no means; they characterize only one side of it. Formalism and exclusivism are in a manner the legal and official tendency of Judaism. But just as these defects are only the exaggeration of certain inferior principles of the ancient religion of Israel, so the higher side of this religion continued to exercise a happy and powerful influence in the midst of Judaism, and produced some new fruits.

The book of Jonah, for example, gives utterance to a breadth of sentiment toward the gentiles that we find nowhere else in the Old Testament. Not only is Jonah

[1] iii. 18–22; vi. 11 f.; ix. 4 f., 11.

[2] *Philosophie des Hebreux*, p. 288; [Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 443].

commissioned by God to preach repentance to Nineveh, a city hostile to Israel, at which so many prophets in the name of Jehovah hurled the most violent threats; but God forgives this city, because it shows itself repentant. While the Jews generally hated and despised the gentiles, here is a book, which, like deutero-Isaiah and the Gospel, teaches them that they must be the light of the nations, to lead them to salvation. To our period belong also a large number of psalms that breathe a profound faith, a piety just as vital as that which we find in the prophetical literature. A portion of the Proverbs, and especially the first nine chapters, also belong to our period. What a profound attachment to virtue finds expression in them! In the book of Sirach and in that of Baruch there are also fine pages, betraying the same faith, the same religious and moral life, as the best canonical books. It is the same with Wisdom, though this book has a strong philosophical tinge. We shall not go into details to prove all this because it would necessitate the repetition in great measure of what we have learned in the second period. We shall confine ourselves to noticing that which is new and characteristic in our period, not that which it has in common with the preceding periods.

Several documents of Judaism are characterized by the fact that in them virtue is represented as true wisdom. According to the oldest documents the first duty of Israel is the practice of righteousness to please the righteous God. The later documents rise to the idea of the wisdom of God; hence the statement is very frequent that the true Israelite should seek and practise wisdom. This mode of thought and expression

first appears in the book of Job and in the Proverbs; it is the ruling one in Sirach and Wisdom. Erroneous ideas on this subject have more than once found utterance: let us then try to bring to light the truth concerning it.

Oehler makes a striking distinction between the wisdom books and the other books of the Old Testament. The former are, in his opinion, the product of a less direct divine inspiration; the sentence of the sage cannot be placed on the same level as the word of Jehovah; it is the product of his experience and reflection.[1] Bruch goes still farther. He not only distinguishes the sages from the priests and the prophets, he contrasts the two parties, making the first free-thinkers, but slightly attached to the theocratic and traditional religion of Israel, veritable philosophers who, like philosophers in general, rose by the exercise of their reason from the empirical and accidental to the absolute.[2] Now we think that these two scholars are mistaken. In Israel no distinction was made, as there is among us, between natural and supernatural revelation, between a less and a more direct divine inspiration, between the products of an unassisted and an inspired reason; they thought that everything in the world depended absolutely and directly upon God. We have even seen that objective wisdom is identified with the spirit and the word of God, that it is represented as an emanation from God, and as the source of the subjective wisdom of man. This latter, then, is not the product of pure reason but of divine wisdom, as the prophetic preaching is the product of divine inspiration. It has for its

[1] § 235. [2] *Weisheitslehre der Hebraer*, pp. 48 ff.

basis faith and not speculation. Finally it pursues a practical and not a speculative or theoretical object like philosophy.

The sages in Israel believe in the same God as the rest of the people. They do not oppose the traditional religion; they take it as their foundation. This is seen in Job and Ecclesiastes, where a critical tendency can be more easily discovered than elsewhere. In the wisdom books it is possible, it is true, to cite passages in which external worship is opposed; but similar passages are also found in the prophets. These books do not concern themselves about the future of the kingdom of God; but the prophets themselves have the present much more in view than the future, and in all the legislative documents of the Old Testament the messianic hope is left out of sight. The sages in Israel, the prophets, the legislators, and the historians, pursued one and the same object, — to teach their people the fear of God and incline them to faithfully keep his commandments. When compared with the points of likeness, the differences among them are merely secondary; they are differences of form and not of substance. The most important is perhaps that the prophets, legislators, and historians, give their principal attention to the people as a whole, while the sages prefer to fix theirs upon the individual life. This is the reason why the latter leave out of sight the future of the kingdom of God, which is identified with the future of the people Israel. But, after these general considerations, let us see what the Scriptures themselves say of subjective wisdom, that we may corroborate what has just been said.

The wisdom of man merits no confidence.[1] True wisdom is not found on earth; it is hidden from the eyes of men; it can only be found with God, who is its source.[2] Those who do evil do not understand what is righteous, but those who seek God understand everything.[3] The law of God and the observance of the law secure true wisdom.[4] It is only bestowed on souls that love it, that seek it by prayer, and keep themselves from evil.[5] The beginning of wisdom is the fear of God.[6] Both alike consist in keeping the commandments of God, which they at the same time make man capable of doing, thus rendering him virtuous;[7] they consist in, and incline to, hatred and avoidance of evil.[8] Thus they secure to man all sorts of blessings, especially life.[9] While wisdom is closely related to the fear of God on the one hand, it is just as closely related to chastisement on the other.[10] This latter may come from God or man, but if it be received with submission it leads

[1] Prov. iii. 5, 7; xxx. 2 ff.; Wis. ix. 6.

[2] Job xxviii. 12–28; xxxii. 8 f.; Prov. viii. 22–36; ii. 6; 1 Kings iii. 12; Ex. xxxi. 3, 6; xxxvi. 1 f.; Eccl. ii. 26; Sir. i. 1, 26; Bar. iii. 15 ff., 29 ff.; Wis. vii. 7, 15; viii. 21; ix. 10, 17. [3] Prov. xxviii. 5.

[4] Ps. xix. 7 f.; xxxvii. 30 f.; cxix. 98 ff., 130; Sir. i. 26; xxiv. 23–27; xxxix. 1 ff.

[5] 1 Kings iii. 10 ff.; Sir. i. 10; xv. 1 ff.; li. 19 ff.; Wis. i. 4 f.; vi. 12 ff., 17 ff.; vii. 7, 27; viii. 21 - ix. 1 ff.

[6] Job. xxviii. 28; Prov. i. 7, 29; ix. 10; Ps. cxi. 10; Sir. i. 14, 16, 20, 27.

[7] Deut. iv. 6; vi. 2, 13, 24; viii. 6; Eccl. xii. 15; Sir. xix. 20; Wis. viii. 7.

[8] Job xxviii. 28; Prov. ii. 10 ff.; iii. 7; viii. 13; xiv. 16; xvi. 6.

[9] Prov. iii. 1 f., 16–18; iv. 8 ff.; viii. 12 ff., 33–36; ix. 10 f.; x. 27; xiii. 14; xiv. 27; xvi. 22; xix. 23; xxiv. 3 ff.; Eccl. vii. 12.

[10] Prov. i. 2, 7; xxiii. 23.

in both cases to wisdom.[1] Thus one must be humble and docile to become wise.[2] Chastisement, like wisdom and the fear of God, leads to life.[3] From the foregoing it is easy to perceive that wisdom is of incalculable value.[4] The opposite of the sage is the fool, who says in his heart that there is no God,[5] and who finds pleasure in doing evil.[6] Thus by associating with fools, one becomes depraved.[7]

It is plain that Israelitish wisdom is essentially religious and practical, and that its character is misunderstood when it is identified with philosophy. Even in Job and Ecclesiastes, the two canonical books in which, if anywhere, it would be possible to find a philosophical tendency, the problems proposed are treated only from the standpoint of practical life. Israelitish wisdom takes no account of abstract or purely metaphysical questions. It feels still less need of elaborating a system of philosophy or dogmatics; at least no trace of one is found anywhere in the Old Testament. It is only the apocryphal book of Wisdom and other writings of Alexandrian Judaism, in which speculation begins to appear. But in these we no longer have pure products of the Israelitish mind. These documents were greatly influenced by Greek philosophy.

The essential object pursued by Israelitish wisdom is expressed in these words of Ecclesiastes, which are, in a sense, a *résumé* of the religion of Israel: "Fear God

[1] Prov. i. 1 f., 8; iii. 11–13; iv. 1; vi. 20; viii. 33; xii. 1; xiii. 1, 24; xv. 5; xix. 20; Job v. 17; Ps. xlix. 11.

[2] Prov. xi. 2. [3] Prov. iv. 13; x. 17.

[4] Job xxviii. 15–19; Prov. iii. 13–18; viii. 11; xvi. 16; xx. 15; Eccl. vii. 19; ix. 16; Sir. vi. 30 f.; xxiv. 20; Wis. vii. 8–10, 14; viii. 5.

[5] Ps. xiv. 1; liii. 1. [6] Prov. x. 23; xiv. 9. [7] Prov. xiii. 20.

and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man."[1] The tendency here dominant is also apparent in the beautiful passage of Proverbs enjoining that the heart be watched more than anything else, because from it flow the sources of life.[2] We should, moreover, add that it is easy to find in the wisdom books, especially Proverbs and Sirach, passages in which wisdom is only prudence, inspired by utilitarian considerations, and having for its sole object the attainment of happiness and the avoidance of misfortune. Thus vice is often represented as folly, bringing one to misfortune and destruction.

## § 34. THE APOCALYPSE OF DANIEL.

From Malachi to Daniel we must leap a great space of time during which there were no prophets. There were none in the times of the Maccabees,[3] the date of the book of which we have still to treat, whose author distinguishes himself from the prophets.[4] The great distance that separates this book from the old prophetical books explains, in part, the difference as to general character existing between them. We have here, as it were, a continuation of ancient prophetism, predictions, the great majority of which relate to the end of the world and the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. These predictions are even more precise than those of any of the old prophetical books. The result is that the book of Daniel has been regarded as the prophetical book *par excellence* by the theology that identifies proph-

[1] xii. 15.
[2] iv. 23.
[3] 1 Macc. iv. 46; ix. 27; xiv. 41.
[4] Dan. ix. 6.

ecy with prediction of the future. If, on the other hand, prophecy be understood as prophetic preaching, such as we find in Israel down to the time of Malachi, it will be admitted that the book of Daniel belongs to another class of writings, to that of apocalypses. We possess a number, among which our book takes the first place as respects antiquity. But of all the products of this kind two only are honored with a place in the biblical canon: our book and the apocalypse of John.

These two books have generally been misunderstood. Until lately a sound and correct method of interpretation for them had not been adopted. But here, as elsewhere, it was very difficult for truth to triumph over hoary error. Many conservative theologians insist on following the wanderings of traditional exegesis, preferring arbitrary interpretations to the results of the historical and only true method. If one undertakes without prejudice the study of these two books, one does not meet the difficulties which have often been found therein, which, in fact, are due to the false standpoint from which they are usually studied. Confining ourselves to the book of Daniel, we shall begin by considering the last three chapters, which are very simple and clear, and which furnish the key to the principal predictions contained in the others.

Chapter x. tells us how Daniel, in a vision, received a communication concerning that which was afterward to befall his people. Chapter xi. next unfolds before our eyes the history of the period from Cyrus to Antiochus Epiphanes. There is first a brief reference to the three successors of Cyrus and the short-lived domin-

ion of Alexander, whose empire is soon to be divided.[1] The author dwells at greater length on the history of the Ptolemies and the Seleucides, with which he was evidently more familiar.[2] He finally reaches Antiochus Epiphanes and devotes to him even more space.[3]

He speaks first of his wars against Egypt, on his return from which he turned his arms against the people of the covenant.[4] He then announces that Antiochus will direct a new attack against Egypt, but that he will not succeed, because of the interference of the Romans, and that then he will divert his fury against the Jewish people; he will leave troops in Palestine who will profane the sanctuary, cause the daily sacrifice to cease and set up the abomination of the destroyer; he will, by his flatteries, seduce the unfaithful Jews; but those of the people who acknowledge God will act with firmness and instruct the multitude, which will bring upon them persecution.[5] The author adds that Antiochus will uplift himself against all the gods and say incredible things against the God of gods; but that he will honor the god of the fortresses (*Jupiter Capitolinus*) whom his fathers did not know.[6] At the time of the end, a last conflict will take place between this king and the king of Egypt; the former will be victorious and invade Palestine, while Edom, Moab, and Ammon will be spared; but news from the east and the north will come to frighten him; he will depart with great

[1] *vv.* 2–4.

[2] *vv.* 5–20. For the explanation of the details of this and the following passages, see the commentaries.

[3] *vv.* 21 ff.

[4] *vv.* 21–28; comp. 1 Macc. i. 17–29; 2 Macc. v. 11 ff.

[5] *vv.* 29–35; comp. 1 Macc. i. 30.

[6] *vv.* 36–39.

fury to destroy multitudes; he will pitch his camp between the sea and the holy mountain; then he will come to his end, with no one to help him.[1] At that time, which will be a time of distress such as there has not been since the nations existed, the Jews written in the book of life will be saved; their dead will arise, some to life everlasting and others to everlasting disgrace. A peculiar glory will be bestowed upon those who have taught righteousness to others. This change will be produced by Michael, the great chief of the Jewish people, who defends it against the chief of the kingdom of the Persians and against that of the Greeks.[2] The end of the world and the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom is, in fact, to come three and a half years or a thousand two hundred and ninety days after Antiochus has caused the perpetual sacrifice to cease and set up the abomination in the temple.[3]

Making what has just been said our starting-point, we shall avoid any difficulty in understanding the other more mysterious predictions of our book, touching the end of the world and the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom.

The first of these predictions is found in Chapter ii. Nebuchadnezzar had had a dream which he could not recall, but of which he nevertheless desired an interpretation. Now since the wise men of Babylon could not tell the dream and its interpretation, he had them put to death. Then the God of the heavens revealed the secret to Daniel, who made it known to the king. In this dream Nebuchadnezzar had seen a great statue,

[1] *vv.* 40–45. [2] xii. 1–3; x. 13–20 f.
[3] xii. 4–13; comp. xi. 31; 1 Macc. i. 46 f., 57; vi. 7.

whose head was of gold, the breast and the arms of silver, the belly and the thighs of brass, the legs of iron, the feet partly of iron and partly of clay; then a stone had loosed itself without the aid of hands, it had smitten the feet of iron and clay, of the statue, and broken them in pieces; then the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold had all been broken and had become like the chaff that escapes from a threshing-floor in summer; the wind had carried them away and no trace of them had been discovered; but the stone that smote the statue had become a great mountain filling the whole earth.[1] According to the explanation given by Daniel, the golden head is Nebuchadnezzar and his empire.[2] The breast represents a kingdom inferior to his.[3] This is evidently that of the Medes and not that of the Persians, which was greater and mightier than that of the Chaldeans. According to the author of our book, the last king of the Chaldeans was replaced by Darius the Mede,[4] who inaugurated a new dynasty. The third kingdom, which will be of brass and is destined to rule the whole earth,[5] is that of the Persians.[6] Our author distinguishes the kingdom and the kings of the Medes from those of the Persians, and connects with Cyrus a new dynasty, that of the Persians, as he connects that of the Medes with Darius.[7] The fourth kingdom, partly strong as iron and partly fragile as clay, which is to be divided,[8] is therefore the kingdom of the Greeks. The alliances which will not issue in a real union[9] are those

[1] ii. 31–35. [2] *v.* 38. [3] *v.* 39.
[4] v. 30; vi. 1; ix. 1; xi. 1. [5] ii. 39.
[6] Comp. Ezra i. 2. [7] vi. 28; viii. 20; x. 1.
[8] ii. 40–42. [9] ii. 43.

of the Seleucides and the Ptolemies,[1] who will not attain union with each other by a lasting peace. In the days of these kings the God of the heavens will raise up a kingdom that will never be destroyed, that will not pass under the rule of another people, that will break and destroy all these kingdoms and itself endure forever.[2] All this agrees admirably with what we have seen above, *viz.*, that the Messianic kingdom will immediately succeed that of the Greeks, in the time of the Ptolemies and the Seleucides, or more exactly in that of Antiochus Epiphanes. This will be confirmed by what follows.

The second messianic prediction of our book is found in Chapter vii. Daniel had a nocturnal vision, in which he saw four different animals come forth from the sea. The first was like a lion and had eagle's wings; the second was like a bear and was to eat much flesh. The third was like a leopard, and had four wings and four heads. The fourth was terrible and extraordinarily strong; he had great iron teeth, he ate, broke, and trod under foot what remained; he had ten horns, but a little horn came forth from their midst and three of the first horns were broken before this horn, which had eyes like man's eyes and a mouth that spoke arrogantly. Then Daniel saw the ancient of days seat himself upon his throne surrounded by thousands of servants, to proceed to judgment; the animals were stripped of their might and the fourth was slain and cast into the fire, because of the arrogant words uttered by the horn. After that he saw coming in the clouds of heaven some one resembling a son of man, who approached the ancient of days; to

[1] xi. 6. [2] ii. 44.

him was given dominion, glory, and kingship, and all the peoples served him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion and his kingdom is never to be destroyed.[1] Daniel inquired of an angel the meaning of all these things, and learned that the four beasts were four kings who were to arise from the earth.[2] He desired expressly to know the truth concerning the fourth animal, concerning the ten horns that it had on its head, and concerning that which had come forth from among the others and appeared greater than they, which he had seen make war on the saints of the Most-High and overcome them until the time when the ancient of days came to do them justice and put them in possession of the kingdom.[3] He received this explanation: The fourth animal is a fourth kingdom that will devour all the earth; the ten horns are ten kings who will arise from this kingdom; another will come after them who will be different from the first and who will humble three kings; he will utter words against the Most-High; he will oppress the saints of the Most-High, and he will hope to change the times and the law; the saints will be delivered into his hands for a time, two times and half a time, *i.e.* three and a half years; then will come the judgment, the dominion will be taken from this king, and everlasting dominion over all the kingdoms that are under heaven will be given to the people of the saints of the Most-High.[4] It is evident that the little horn on which the author of our book especially dwells, is Antiochus Epiphanes,[5] whose

[1] vii. 1–14. [2] vii. 15–17. [3] vii. 19–22. [4] vii. 23–27.

[5] Comp. what is said in this chapter with xi. 31, 36; 1 Macc. i. 46 ff.; 2 Macc. vi. 6.

dominion must come to an end after three and a half years, according to verse 25 of our chapter, as according to xii. 7. The fourth animal, then, represents the Greek empire founded by Alexander, and the ten horns of his head ten kings, his successors; the third animal is the Persian empire, and its four heads are four kings, our author not being acquainted with a greater number;[1] the second animal is naturally the Medean empire, and the first the Babylonian empire. According to this chapter, also, the Messianic empire is to immediately follow that of the Greeks in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Thus far all the competent and impartial exegetes of our day are agreed; but they differ on the question, Who is the some one like a son of man who comes on the clouds of heaven and obtains everlasting dominion over all the peoples?[2] The general opinion has always been that it is the Messiah. Even in the book of Enoch this latter receives the title, Son of man.[3] It is also well known that Jesus preferred this title as a Messianic designation for himself. But as the book of Daniel nowhere speaks of the Messiah, though it says much of the coming of the Messianic kingdom, some modern scholars have thought that this expression serves to designate, not the Messiah, but the Messianic kingdom; that this latter is compared to a man coming from heaven, on account of its high dignity and its celestial origin, while the heathen powers, the powers of this world, are compared to animals coming forth from the sea, on account of their inferior dignity and their ter-

[1] xi. 2. [2] vii. 13 f.

[3] Wittichen, *Beiträge zur bibl. Theol.* II. pp. 67 ff., III. p. 128; Stapfer, p. 123; [Toy, p. 354].

restrial origin. What favors this view is that in the explanatory part of our chapter the kingdom is constantly promised to the saints of the Most-High,[1] *i.e.* to the Jewish people.

Chapter viii. contains another vision of Daniel. A ram appeared to him that had two horns, one of which was higher than the other and rose last. This ram smote with his horns toward the east, the north, and the south, and no other animal was able to resist him.[2] Daniel then saw a he-goat coming from the west, that passed through the whole earth without touching it, and had a great horn between the eyes; and he smote the ram, and broke his two horns, and cast him to the earth, and trampled on him, and no one could deliver him. But when this he-goat had become very mighty his great horn was broken, and four great horns arose in its place toward the four winds of heaven.[3] From one of these went forth a little horn that grew much toward the south, the east, and the most beautiful of countries (Judea); it exalted itself to the host of heaven and to the chief of the host, from whom it removed the perpetual sacrifice, overthrowing his holy place; it finally cast truth to the earth; and this profanation was to last two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings, after which the sanctuary would be purified.[4] According to the explanation that the angel Gabriel gives to Daniel, the ram represents the king of the Medes and Persians.[5] The smaller horn of the ram is the power of the Medes, and the larger that arose afterward the power of the Persians;[6] and since, according

[1] *vv.* 18, 22, 17. [2] *vv.* 3 f. [3] Comp. xi. 4.
[4] viii. 5–14. [5] viii. 20. [6] Comp. ii. 59.

to history, the latter absorbed the former both may be represented by a single animal having two horns. As for the he-goat, it is the king of Javan, the king of Greece; the great horn between the eyes is the first king (Alexander); the four horns that arise to take the place of this broken horn are four kingdoms which will arise from this nation, but which will not have so much strength (they are the four kingdoms that were finally formed from the empire of Alexander); at the close of their dominion there will arise a shameless and crafty king whose power will grow, who will destroy the powerful and also the people of the saints, who will cause many peaceable men to perish, and will exalt himself against the prince of princes; but he will be broken without hands.[1] If we compare this vision with the preceding we see clearly that we again close with Antiochus Epiphanes, the chief object of our book. It is he who is represented by the little horn that rises from one of the four horns,[2] or from the kingdom of Syria; for all that is here said of him agrees with the previous references to him. This vision, like those preceding, relates to the end of all things, the end of the world.[3] We have seen that the end will come when the people of the saints shall have been oppressed, and the perpetual sacrifice interrupted three and a half years, or 1290 days.[4] According to our chapter this time is to last 2300 evenings and mornings,[5] or 1150 days, which make only a little more than three years. The difference between the two intervals is, therefore,

[1] viii. 21–35.
[2] viii. 9.
[3] viii. 17, 19, 23; comp. x. 14; xi. 35 f., 40.
[4] vii. 25; xii. 7, 11.
[5] *v.* 14.

inconsiderable, and is explained by the very natural supposition that the visions of our book do not all date from the same time, that there was an interval between them.

Chapter ix. informs us that Daniel, seeing from the book of Jeremiah[1] that the overthrow and oppression of Jerusalem was to last seventy years, wished to know how this prediction was to be understood.[2] This desire seems the more natural at the time when our book was composed, since several centuries had elapsed without the fulfilment of this prophecy, and the Jews still groaned under the hated yoke of the stranger. After an ardent prayer, in which Daniel confesses the sins of his people and implores the forgiveness of God,[3] the angel Gabriel comes to explain to him that the seventy years in question are weeks of years, or periods of seven years. This lapse of time was determined to put an end to sins, to expiate iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to anoint the holy of holies.[4] From the date when the prophecy of Jeremiah was uttered to that when a prince will be anointed there are seven weeks; for sixty-two more weeks the places and moats will be rebuilt, but in troublous times; then, in the last week an anointed one will be cut off, the city and the sanctuary will be destroyed by the people of a prince whose end will come as by a flood, who, for a week, will make a firm alliance with many, and will for half a week cause the sacrifice and offering to cease, who will commit the most abominable deeds until overthrow finally breaks upon him.[5] In spite of some obscurities in this proph-

[1] xxv. 11 ff.; xxix. 10. [2] ix. 1 ff. [3] ix. 5 ff.
[4] Comp. viii. 14. [5] ix. 20 ff.

ecy the essential points are perfectly clear. Thus, the seventy years of Jeremiah become weeks of years, *i.e.* periods of seven years. These seventy weeks of years are divided into three periods, of which the first includes seven weeks, or forty-nine years, the second sixty-two weeks, or 434 years, the third one week, or seven years. Since, according to *vv.* 26 f., the prince who is to reign during this last week will cause the sacrifice and offering to cease for half a week, *i.e.* for three and a half years, and since all that is here said perfectly agrees with what we have seen touching Antiochus Epiphanes and the end of the world,[1] we are authorized in saying that this prophecy, like those preceding, closes with this prince, that this is the limit of the prophetic horizon of our author, as well as the end of the ills of the Jewish people and the end of the world, which will be followed by the Messianic kingdom. As to the first period of seven weeks, it extends from the prediction of Jeremiah to Cyrus the anointed one, to whom reference is made in *v.* 25.[2] The second period of sixty-two weeks, then, necessarily extends from Cyrus to Antiochus. The anointed one who will be cut off at the end of this period is probably the high-priest Onias whose death is mentioned, 2 Macc. iv. 34. This lapse of time, it is true, is more than half a century too short, according to exact chronology. But instead of taking useless pains to make this prediction agree with chronology, we must rather admit that, in the days of our author, the Jews did not have a thorough chronology, and that he him-

[1] See especially vii. 25 ; viii. 11–14 ; xi. 31, 36, 45 ; xii. 7, 11.

[2] Comp. Isa. xlv. 1.

self, in many a passage of his book, proves that he was acquainted only with the grand outlines of history. The historian Josephus made a similar mistake.[1] That here noticed ought to surprise us the less since our book has a practical and not a historical aim.

Though the apocalypse of Daniel foretells the coming of the Messianic era in a series of prophecies, it nowhere gives a description of it, as most of the old prophets did. It is content with leading us to the threshold of the new era which is to begin with the approaching end of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, the great persecutor of the faithful Jews and their religion. It is content to say repeatedly that this era will be that of the universal and everlasting dominion of the saints of the Most-High, *i.e.* of the faithful Jews, and, therefore, of their God.[2] In this our author is inspired with the view of the old prophets; it is the same when he teaches that the end of the world and the Messianic kingdom are very near, when he sees in the political events of his time the precursors of the final judgment, a prelude to the Messianic era.

## CONCLUSION.

Having fulfilled our task as historian, we might now lay down our pen. Before doing so, however, we believe it our duty to add some remarks in response, not to the historical, but to the religious interest, the interest of faith.

The Bible was originally a book for the edification

[1] Schürer, *The Jewish People*, etc., Div. I. Vol. I. p. 81.

[2] See especially iv. 3.

of the pious. Later the theologians made it a fountain of doctrine, a dogmatic authority, the supreme and infallible authority in matters of faith. Thenceforth it hardly occurred to any one to study the Bible except from the dogmatic standpoint. It was left for those of our day to begin to study it as a historical document, and according to the historical method. Biblical theology as a historical science is, in fact, of recent date. But there is now danger of going to the opposite extreme and studying the Bible henceforth only from the historical and critical standpoint, losing sight of its religious value, the value that it has for faith.

We think that it is indispensable to study the Scriptures historically, that indeed we must commence in this way. It is the only way to avoid the erroneous view in which traditional dogmatism has always represented it. This is the reason why, in our work, we have followed the strictly historical method. We think, however, that those who study the Bible by this method should take especial pains to show that its religious value is not impaired, as many people imagine. If they neglected this duty they would sin against believers. They would fix a great gulf between science and faith; they would prepare the way for divorcing historical truth from piety, a result that would be a sad one for both; for faith would thenceforward be without truth, and truth without faith; faith would no longer be anything but superstition, and truth would become inseparable from unbelief. Such a divorce, then, is at any cost to be avoided, and these last few lines have for their object to show how this is possible.

To examine, to study the Bible as we have done, is

to take account of the historical development of the ideas and customs that are there revealed; it is to show that these have not always been the same, that they have varied in the course of time; it is to admit more or less important divergencies among the biblical documents, doctrinal and historical errors committed by the sacred authors. This is what startles faith: it fears that it will see the foundation on which it rests shaken. Is it really so? In a sense, Yes. Faith in the orthodox sense of intellectual adherence to a dogmatic system, considered as perfect and infallible, because, as it claims, it is drawn from an infallible source, the Bible, and rests on its infallible authority,— such a faith is evidently impaired beyond recovery by the historical study of the Bible. But is this true faith, faith in the biblical sense? Certainly not. It is the product of Jewish rabbinism and Christian dogmatism.

Faith, as the Bible, especially the Old Testament, freed from rabbinical influence, understands it, is not faith in the sacred letter, the written word, but faith in the manifestation of God in history, in his interference in the world with a view to the salvation of humanity, faith in the living word, inspired by the divine spirit in the prophets, faith in the holy mission of these men of God. Now we claim that this faith is not impaired, and could not be by the historical study of the Bible, because this faith has for its foundation not simple words, but facts, evident and undeniable facts.

When, having shown the divergencies, contradictions, errors in the Bible, we go below the surface to the substance of things, we are obliged to admit that

the Bible has not only a human, imperfect, transitory side, but also a divine, perfect, unchangeable, eternal side. Some have wished to see only the former, others only the latter side. To be fully in the right we must recognize that one exists as well as the other. This is coming to be understood more and more even among conservative theologians. There, then, is not the great difficulty. It is rather in separating, distinguishing, in the Bible, the divine from the human elements. This difficulty, together with habit and tradition, leads many pastors who would probably admit the human and imperfect side of the Scriptures, to speak of them nevertheless as if they were from one end to the other the unadulterated word of God. This is encouraging Christian people in an illusion which is thought innocent but which may, and many times does, become injurious. In fact when the people learn, and the day comes sooner or later, that the Bible contains errors, they are led to doubt revelation itself, since they have been made to believe that it is to be identified with the so-called infallible letter of the sacred Scriptures.

What then is to be done? Can we distinguish in the Bible the human from the divine elements, the human errors from the divine truth? Can we say that such a biblical word or text is inspired, and that such another is not? No, such a mode of procedure would be very mechanical and superficial; besides it would be impracticable. We must rather recognize that traditional faith and theology have been led astray by the doctrine of the literal inspiration of the sacred code, invented by the Jewish rabbis and adopted by the Christian doctors. It is not the dead letter in which inspir-

ation and revelation are to be sought, as this doctrine would have it, but the direct action of the spirit of God upon the hearts of men. Let us explain, confining ourselves to the Old Testament, with which we have thus far had to do.

We have just represented it as an undeniable fact that this part of the Scriptures contains errors. He who gives his attention exclusively to sacred criticism instead of attempting the historical reconstruction of the biblical teaching, as we have done, will be able to discover many more errors than have been casually noticed or become apparent from our work; he will be able to show that there exist a large number of scientific, historical, and doctrinal errors. The fact that we have stated is therefore fully established. But there is another which it seems to us is just as well established; it is that the *élite* of the Israelitish nation — at the head of whom were the prophets, the psalmists, the sacred authors in general — were under the influence of the spirit of God, which communicated to them a life and a loftier insight, of which we find the expression, the translation, imperfect but actual, in the Old Testament. In the midst of the people Israel, originally idolatrous, and subject to all the vices of the Semitic race, there was formed a nucleus of men of God much superior to those about them in faith, in insight, in ethical life. They were by no means perfect, either with respect to ideas or morals. They yielded in some measure to the influence of their time; for no one can completely withdraw himself from the influence of his age and his environment. But, in spite of the imperfections that they shared with the men of their time,

they rose to so pure ideas concerning God and our relations to him, that thus far they have not been surpassed. That which seems to us, however, still more remarkable than these ideas, to which the intellectualistic theology of the past has wrongly attributed an exaggerated or even exclusive value, that which appears to us more important, is the superior life that distinguished these men of God. There, especially, we clearly discover the divine activity.

The history of ancient Greece proves that, left to its own powers, human thought can rise to very pure moral and religious conceptions, and give admirable precepts. But it also proves that in spite of fine precepts and lofty thoughts a people or an individual may remain morally corrupt. We meet this fact everywhere and in all times. Man is naturally egoistic, and incapable of breaking the yoke of his egoism. There is therefore much more need of moral than of intellectual assistance, and purity of moral life is a safer criterion of the divine action upon the heart than lofty conceptions. Now among the *élite* of the people Israel, and more particularly among the prophets, we find an ethical life that is truly remarkable. We find these men animated by a sincere and profound love for God, by an ardent zeal for his glory and the establishment of his kingdom. These men forgot themselves, living only for God and their fellows, and that out of pure love for God and men; they even endured, for the sake of the holy cause that they defended, the severest persecutions. When we examine the documents of the Old Testament, and especially the Psalms and the prophetical books, we find ourselves confronted not merely by a beautiful

morality, beautiful precepts recommended to others; these writings are the living, so to speak, palpitating expression of what took place in their souls; we find there the expression and experience of a higher life, a life produced by God and devoted to God. Behind these writings we feel the beat of the hearts that inspired them, and behind these hearts we feel a higher power, a divine, regenerating, sanctifying influence.

We find then, in the midst of the people Israel, the foundation of the kingdom of God, the kingdom of truth and holiness, the substructure of that glorious edifice of which Christ has become the corner stone, which will continue to rise under the action of the same divine spirit that filled the prophets, and is the soul of all the development of the kingdom of God throughout the ages. Here then is a solid, immovable basis for faith. It rests, not upon simple words, but upon facts, historical facts of which the aggregate constitutes the kingdom of God; facts which date from times the most remote and reveal to us traces of the action of God upon the heart, an action which we can discover through all the ages and even about us wherever there are believing hearts; facts which we experience in our own hearts when we open them to the beneficent influence of the spirit of God.

Faith is therefore not impaired by a scientific and historical study of the Bible. That which alone is impaired is the dogmatism that must needs stay itself upon an infallible authority. Faith and piety can do without this authority because they can do without infallible dogmatic truth. The apostle Paul confesses without reserve that Christian knowledge is not perfect here

below, that we can hope to attain a perfect knowledge only in eternity.[1] But in spite of his imperfect knowledge what mighty faith the great apostle of the gentiles possessed! And our faith may also be firm, powerful, living, though we have not a perfect knowledge of dogmatic and metaphysical truth, since we have no infallible source and norm for this truth.

It is enough for faith to have a firm foundation on which it can rest, to feel a mighty impulse urging it toward God, to possess a confident assurance that God graciously receives sinful man to pardon and sanctify him. It is enough for the world in general that God is so clearly revealed in his holiness and love that each can recognize his sinful condition, and then hope for the divine favor. This legitimate want is partly satisfied even in the revelation of the old covenant; it is fully satisfied by the final revelation of the new covenant, to which we shall feel it a pleasure and a duty to turn our attention if the public favorably receive this, our first essay.

[1] 1 Cor. xiii. 9–12.

# INDEXES.[1]

## I. TOPICS TREATED.


Aaron: in early documents, 46; according to C, 286 f.; in Chronicles, etc., 288 f.
Abraham, the ideal Hebrew, 34 f.
Abstinence from wine, 70.
Advocate (redeemer) of Job, 269 f.
Anathema, 67 f.
Angels: nature, 153 f.; functions, 154, 254, 256; form, 154 f.; orders, 254; names, 255; origin of belief in, 155 f.
Anthropomorphism: early prevalence, 25 ff.; overcome by the prophets, 97; corrected by the Jews, 248.
Anthropopathism, 27 f.
Antiochus Epiphanes, the central figure of Daniel, 333, 334, 336, 337 f., 340.
Apocryphal books cited, 6.
Ark of the Covenant: a symbol of Jehovah's presence, 28, 282; a centre of worship, 42.
Asmodeus, 262.
Atonement: terms used, 311 ff.; object affected, 312 ff.; means employed, 313; limits, 310 f.; theory, 314 ff.
Atonement, day of, 304 ff.
Attributes of God: moral, 114 ff.; metaphysical, 120 ff.

Beasts, the four, of Daniel, 336 ff.
Body, origin and nature of, 159 f., 263 f.
Bowels = seat of affections, 166.

Centralization: rooted in early history, 42; the struggle for, 178 ff.; the accomplishment of, 280 ff.
Cherubim, 148 ff.
Circumcision: practice of, 57; meaning of, 33, 58 f.
Compilation, evidence of, in the Hexateuch, 8.
Covenant: a fundamental notion, 29 f., 91; ground of, 30, 118; nature of, 31 ff.; duties, 33, 102, 174, 318; sign of, 33, 58; renewal of, 207 ff.; the new, and the gentiles, 212 ff.; abuse of the notion of, 320.
Covenant, book of, 36 ff.
Creation: statements concerning, 125 f.; nature of, 126 f.; biblical, *vs.* scientific doctrine, 127 ff.; bearing of, on monotheism, 93.

Daniel, Apocalypse of, 331 ff.
David: first Hebrew hymnist, 9; an ethical ideal, 35 f.; and the Messiah, 218 ff.
Day of judgment: date of, 201 f., 334, 337, 340, 342 ff.; effects of, 203 ff.; means used, 202 f., 206.
Death, 263 f.
Deborah, song of, 21.


[1] Prepared by the translator.

Decalogue: age of, 9, 21; contents of, 37 f.; on the Sabbath, 292 f.
Demonology, 256 ff.
Devil, 260 f.
Divination among the early prophets, 16 ff., 81.
Divine element in Scripture, 129, 348 f.
Documents of the Hexateuch, 3 ff.

Ecclesiastes and Job, 324.
*Elohim:* signification, 111 f.; a favorite name, 249.
Ephod, 19, 28.
Eternity of God, 121 f.
Ethical life: Hebrew, 34 ff.; Jewish, 316 ff.
Evil, moral: origin of, 196 f.; God's agency in, 133.
Evil, physical: cause of, 194 f.; author of, 132; uses of, 202 ff., 230 ff., 273 f.
Exclusivism: germs of, 34; persistence of, 213; exaggeration of, 320 ff.
Exile: destructive to idolatry, 247; favorable to centralization, 180 f.; productive of exclusivism, 321 f.
Ezekiel: on the cherubim, 148; on the Messiah, 219; the apostle of Levitism, 276, 280, 285 f., 293, 300, 303, 308 f., 313.
Ezra, compiler of the Law, 242 f.

Face of God, 143 f.
Faith: an essential of Hebrew piety, 178; decay of, 324; relation to science, 128 f., 345, 349 f.
Faithfulness of God: in the name Jehovah, 102 f.; relation to his truthfulness, 115; his justice, 116; his grace, 117 f.
Faithfulness to Jehovah, 173 ff.
Fall: details of, 193 f.; thought of, 187, 194 f.; effect of, 193 f., 196.
Fasting: early practice, 71 ff.; on the day of atonement, 304 ff.
Fear of God, 175, 329 f.
Feasts, Pilgrim: earlier usages, 49 ff.; later modifications, 300 ff.
First-born, 63 f.
First-fruits, 63 f.
Forgiveness. See Atonement.
Formalism: effect of, 317; opposed by the prophets, 319.
Freedom, human: relation to divine sovereignty, 131 ff.; to sin, 195 f.
Future life: early notions of, 214 f.; supposed traces of a doctrine, 269 ff.; influence of current ideas, 234, 267 f.; need of knowledge concerning, 238 f.

Gentiles: responsible to Jehovah, 93 f., 204 ff.; participants in the new covenant, 212 ff.; later attitude toward, 320 ff.
Glory of God, 138 ff.
Glossolaly, 88, 90.
God, idea of: early notions, 21 ff.; development among the prophets, 91 ff.; latest phases, 247 ff.
God of hosts, 103 ff.
Gods other than Jehovah: proofs of recognition of, 22 ff.; denial of, 94 ff., 247.
Grace of God, 117 ff.
Gratitude as an element of piety, 176 f.
Guilt of sin, 197 ff.
Guilt offering, 308 f.

Hagiographa, 245 f.
Harvest, feast of. See Feast of Weeks.
Head, as the seat of thought, 166 f.
Heart, in man's life: uses of the term, 162 f.; comparison with other organs, 164 ff.
Heredity as applied to guilt, 200 f.
Hexateuch: origin, 3 ff., 241 ff.; structure, 8.
High-places: worship at, 40 ff.; opposition to, 178 f.; abolition of, 180 f., 280.

High-priest: age of the office, 182 f.; final functions, 286 ff., 291.
Historical sense among the Hebrews, 7 f.
Holiness of God: meaning of, 106 ff.; relation to his jealousy, etc., 109 f.; propitiated by atonement, 312 f.
Holy One of Israel, 106 f.
Human element in the Bible, 345 ff.

Ideals, ethical, 34 ff., 189 f.
Idolatry: of the early Hebrews, 10 f., 28 f.; persistence of, 82, 179 f., 186.
Image of God, 169 ff.
Immortality of the soul, 274 ff.
Imperfections of Scripture, 27 f., 36 f., 90, 128 f., 187 f., 217, 345 ff.
Imputation, 198 ff., 230 f., 233.
Individualism, 33.
Inspiration: of the prophets, 83 f.; in the Scriptures, 347 f.

Jealousy of God, 109.
Jehovah: etymology, 99 f.; signification, 101 ff.
Jeremiah: on sacrifices, 184; on the Messiah, 219.
Jerusalem, the centre of humanity, 215.
Jesus, typified by the Servant, 226; the corner-stone of the kingdom of God, 349.
Job, book of: outline of, 236 f.; on the problem of evil, 237 f.; on the future life, 239, 269 f.; on Satan, 257 f.
Josiah's reform, 180.
Jubilee, year of, 298 f.
Justice of God, 115 ff.

Knowledge concerning God: an element of Hebrew piety, 178; denied by Jews, 248 f.

Law: the earliest fragments, 36 ff., 241 f.; the rule of life, 187 f.; the development, 242; adoption of, 242 f.; importance of, to the Jews, 243 f.
Levites: original relation to the priesthood, 44 ff.; according to Deuteronomy, 181 ff.; under the restoration, 285 ff., 289 f.
Levitism, 276 ff.
Likeness of God, 170.
Literature of O. T. Theology, 3 ff.
Logos: identified with the *malakh*, 146; origin of doctrine of, 250.
Lord (my), 114.
Love of God, 119 f.
Love as an element of piety: toward God, 175 f.; toward one's neighbor, 177 f.

*Malakh* of God, 144 ff.
Man: nature of, 159 ff.; dignity of, 167 ff.; primitive condition of, 192 ff.
Manifestation of God, 137 ff.
Messiah: origin of the idea of, 218; identity of, 218 ff.; functions of, 222; character and qualifications, 223 ff.; not the Servant of deutero-Isaiah, 228; nor the son of man in Daniel, 338 f.
Messianic kingdom, 334, 338, 340 ff.
Method in Biblical Theology, 1, 344 f.
Mighty One, 113.
Miracles, 136 f.
Monolatry: the early Hebrew religion, 21 ff.; a stage toward monotheism, 92.
Monotheism: age of, 22 ff., 92 ff.; triumph of, 247.
Mosaism, 7 ff.
Moses: historical reality of, 9; work of, 7, 9, 11, 21, 30, 46.
Most-High, 113.
Music, as a stimulus to inspiration, 15.

Name of God, 141 f.
Names of God: number and signification, 99 ff.; *Elohim* and *Yahweh*, 249 f.
Nature, forces of, personified, 156.
Nature: laws of, 134 f.; restoration of, 210 f.
Nazirate, 68 ff.

Nebuchadnezzar's image, 334 ff.
Necromancy, 20.
Nehemiah: his reforms, 278 f., 295; his Pharisaism, 320.
New moon: the original festival, 48 f.; later development, 299 f.

Omnipotence of God, 120 f.
Omnipresence of God, 122 f.
Omniscience of God, 123 f.

Particularism. See Exclusivism.
Passover, feast of: origin of, 50 f.; union with that of unleavened bread, 51 f.; laws concerning, 52 f.; significance of, 53 f.; final modifications, 300 f.
Patriarchs, religion of, 10.
Pentateuch. See Hexateuch.
Periods in Biblical Theology, 2.
Personality of God, 96 f.
Pharisaism, 316 ff.
Philosophy, Greek, and its influence, 248, 253, 275 f.
Prayer, 65.
Priesthood: original universality of, 43 ff.; assumption by the Levites, 45 f.; secured to the Levites by Deuteronomy, 181 ff.; Ezekiel's innovations, 285 f.; final stage of development, 286 ff.; theory of, 289 ff.
Priests as agents of revelation, 18.
Prophetism: in its origin, 11 ff.; in its purity, 81 ff.
Prophets: beginning from Moses, 11 f.; schools of, 12 ff.; state of, when prophesying, 14 ff., 87 ff.; sometimes also priests, 17 f.; means employed by, 81 f.; attitude toward idolatry, 82; names applied to, 83 ff.; the source of their gifts, and authority, 84, 347 ff.; functions of, 85 f.; relation of, to ritual, 183 ff., 276 f.; tendency of, to universalism, 212 ff.
Prophets, *i.e.* the second division of the canon, 244 f.
Providence, 129 ff.
Psychology, biblical, 159, 164 f.
Purifications: variety of, 75; significance of, 75 f.
Purim, feast of, 306.

Ram and he-goat of Daniel, 339 f.
Reins = heart, 166.
Resurrection: rise of doctrine of, 273 f.; relation to immortality, 275 f.
Retribution: guaranteed by divine justice, 116; early theory of, 233 f.; later speculations concerning, 234 ff.
Righteousness: essence of, 174 ff., 317 ff.; relative character of, 189 ff.

Sabbath: original notion of, 47 f.; Levitical doctrine of, 292 ff.
Sabbatical year, 296 ff.
Sacrifices: antiquity of, 59 f., 307 f.; early simplicity of, 60 f.; notion of, 61 f.; human, 62; later complexity, 307 f.; final varieties, 308 f.
Sages of Israel, 327 f.
Salvation: grounds for, 207; participants in, 207, 212 ff.; conditions of, 207 f.; blessings of, 209 ff.
Samuel: greatness of, 12; connection with schools of prophets, 12 f.; a priest, 45.
Sanctuary, the: in the desert, 281; at Jerusalem, 179, 180 f., 280; idea of, 281 ff.; erroneous conceptions of, 283 ff.
Satan, 258 ff.
Scepticism, 323 ff.
Scripture, Holy: origin of, 241 ff.; authority of, 246.
Scriptures = Hagiographa, 245.
Seers, as compared with prophets, 83.
Seraphim, 150 ff.
Serpent of Eden, 260 f.
Servant of Jehovah: identity of, 226 ff.; work of, 214, 228 ff.; origin of idea of, 233.
Sheol, the abode of the dead, 264 ff.

Signs as means of revelation, 19.
Sin: forms of, 185 f.; essence of, 186 ff.; extent of, 189 ff.; origin of, 192 ff.; guilt of, 197 ff.
Sin offering, 308 f.
Solidarity: a feature of the covenant, 33; an element in theodicy, 334 f.
Son of man in Daniel, 338.
Soul, the spiritual principle in man: terms employed, 160 ff.; actual conception of, 164 f.; pre-existence of, 167.
Sovereignty of God, 131 ff.
Speculation among the Jews: with reference to God, 247 ff.; the product of Greek philosophy, 330.
Spirit of God: meaning of, 98 f.; in the prophets, 83 f., 347 ff.; a manifestation of God, 156 f.; agent of creation, 126, 135; a force in human experience, 157 f.; relation to evil, 158; a supposed hypostasis, 250.
Spirit of man, 161 ff.
Spirituality of God: unknown to the ancient Hebrews, 25, 28; grasped by the prophets, 97; nature of the conception, 98 f.
Spirits, evil: early conceptions, 158; later ideas, 256 ff.
Strong One, 113.
Substitution, supposed, 315 f.

Tabernacle: unreality of, 280; idea of, 281 f.
Tabernacles, feast of: earlier celebration of, 55 f.; later modifications, 303 f.
Teraphim, 28.
Theocratic idea: origin of, 21 f.; exemplified in offerings, etc., 63; relation to the Messianic, 209.
Theology: foreign to the prophets, 91 f., 98; pursued by the Jewish doctors, 247 f.
Tithes: symbolism of, 63; destination of, 64 f.
Translation of Enoch and Elijah, as bearing on death, 264.
Tree of life, 194, 263 f.
Trinity, supposed traces of doctrine of, 225, 226, 250 ff.

Uncleanness: forms of, 73 f.; theory concerning, 77 f.; conditions related to, 78 f.
Unity of God, 92.
Universalism: first traces of, 119 f.; best expressions of, 212 ff., 325 f.; reaction against, 320 f.
Unleavened bread, feast of, 50 f., 53 f.
*Urim* and *thummim*, 17 f., 20.

Vengeance of God, 111.
Visions: as forms of prophecy, 87 f.; as a means of revelation, 17, 89.
Vows, 66 f.

Watchman = prophet, 85 f.
Weeks, feast of: early regulations concerning, 54 f.; adaptation of, to the Levitical system, 302 f.
Weeks, the seventy, of Daniel, 341 ff.
Wine, abstinence from, 70.
Wisdom: as a synonym for virtue, 326 f.; power of, 329 f.; nature and object, 330 f.
Wisdom of God: late origin of the doctrine, 124; as a hypostasis, 250 ff.
Woman: position of, 36, 59; relation to man, 168 f.
Word of God: as a message to the prophets, 83 f., 87; as a manifestation of God, 250.
Works, merit of, 319 f.
Worship: primitive character of, 39 ff.; modifications of, during the prophetic period, 178 ff.; development of, into Levitism, 276 ff.
Worship, places of: ancient freedom respecting, 39 ff.; reforms concerning, 178 ff.; reduced to one, 280 ff.
Wrath of God, 109 f.

*Yahweh* or Jehovah: signification of, 99 ff.; use of, 249 f.

## II. AUTHORS QUOTED.

Anger, R., 218.

Baudissin, W. W.: *Studien*, I.: 23, 24, 25, 92, 93, 94, 95, 112, 152, 261; II.: 31, 40, 106, 107, 138.
Baur, Gus.: de Wette's *Psalmen*, 104; *Gesch. d. A. T. Weissagung*, 218.
Beck, J. T., 164.
Bertheau, E.: *JDT.*, 91; *Richter*, 112.
[Bible Commentary, 70.]
Bleek, F., 83, 88.
Bruch, J. F., 127, 195, 327.
Bruston, C., 224, 225.
Budde, K., 153.

[Cheyne, T. K., 104.]
Cölln, D. G. K. von, 2, 104, 167, 275.

Delitzsch, F.: [*Genesis*, 101, 153]; *Psalms*, 104, 112; *Psychology*, 164.
Diestel, L., 115, 117.
Dillmann, A.: *Genesis*, 128, 129, 153; *Exodus u. Leviticus*, 37, 38, 44, 47, 50, 51, 52, 54, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 68, 75, 101, 112, 146, 293, 294, 295.
[Dods, M., 128, 129.]
[Driver, S. R., 325.]

Ewald H., 41, [49, 50, 58, 62, 71, 77, 78, 306.]

Graf, K. H., 64, 65.
Grimm, C. L. W., 126.

Haag, E., 124, 259, 275.
Hävernick, H. A. C., 101, 104, 114, 170, 199.
Harless, G. C. A., 164.
Hengstenberg, E. W., 87.
Hitzig, F.: *Daniel*, 273; *Bib. Theol.*, 112; *Mes. Weissagung*, 218.
Hofmann, J. C. K.: *Schriftbeweis*, 112, 170; *Theologie*, 164.
Hupfeld, H., 104.

Knobel, A.: *Exodus u. Leviticus*, 261, 284; *Prophetismus*, 158.
Köhler, A., 91.
Kuenen, A.: *Hist. Critique*, 88; [*Rel. of Israel*, 30, 96, 112, 275.]

[Lenormant, F., 129, 150, 153.]

Maybaum, S., 13, 18, 83.
[Montefiore, C. G., 19, 23, 92, 95, 274.]
Müller, J., 172.

Nicolas, M., 2, 248, 250, 255, 256, 273, 274, 275.

Oehler, G. F., 2, 18, 51, 58, 59, 88, 101, 104, 109, 112, 113, 114, 115, 137, 142, 146, 155, 156, 165, 167, 170, 183, 199, 202, 225, 259, 270, 327.

Philo, 87, 248.

Reuss, E.: *Geschichte d. heil. Schriften A. T.*, 11, 14, 19, 30, 47, 50, 53, 58, 112, 126, 153, 162, 242, 269, 278; *La Bible* (misc.), 15, 19, 50, 53, 58, 142, 146, 151, 153, 224, 225, 270, 271, 273; *Prophète*, 11, 14, 88, 104; *Hist. Sainte*, 47, 48, 50, 53, 65, 172, 298; *Philosophie*, 269, 275, 325; *Apocalypse*, 274; *Théol. Chrét.*, 274.
Riehm, E.: *Gesetzgebung Mosis*, 64; *Mes. Prophecy*, 90; *Stud. u. Krit.*, 312.
Riehm's *Handwörterbuch*, 19, 49, 50, 55, 58, 59, 64, 70, 71, 129, 150, 293, 298.
Ritschl, A., 109.
[Robertson, J., 14.]
Rothe, R., 195.

[Schaff-Herzog's *Cyclopedia*, 75, 172.]

Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexikon*, 49, 50, 51, 55, 57, 58, 70, 71, 73, 77, 100, 104, 150, 306.
Schrader, E.: *JPT.*, 104; [*KAT.*, 47, 100.]
Schultz, H., 11, [24,] 25, [40, 48, 64, 70, 88, 93, 94,] 98, 101, [104, 106,] 109, 112, 113, 114, [117,] 126, [127,] 143, [146,] 150, 151, 155, [158,] 164, 167, 170, 171, 172, 188, 196, 202, [224, 225,] 269, [315,] 318.
Schürer, E., 244, 343.
Segond, L., 6, 69.
Seinecke, L., 274.
[Smith, G. A., 224.]
[Smith, W. R.: *Old Test.*, 18, 19, 242; *Prophets*, 23, 31, 70, 91, 106.]
[Smith's *Dictionary*, 20, 57, 88, 150, 151, 284, 293.]
Stapfer, E., 2, 248, 250, 255, 338.
Steiner, 58.

[Toy, C. H., 248, 250, 255, 259, 338.]
Tholuck, F. A. G., 88.

Umbreit, F. W. K., 193.

Vatke, W., 19, 30, 46.

Wellhausen, J., 18, 46, [51, 53, 55, 64,] 65, 182, 195, 278, 281, 287, 288, 294, 296, 298.
Wette, W. M. L. de: *Archeologie*, 62, 66, 77, 78, 104, 112, 155, 156, 167; *Bib. Dogmatik*, 2, 98.
Winer's *Realwörterbuch*, 20, 151, 284.
Wittichen, C., 338.

## III. PASSAGES CITED IN THE TEXT.

### Genesis.

PAGE
i. ....126, 128
i. 1 ....126
i. 2 ....250
i. 26 ....169, 170, 172
i. 26 f. ....169
i. 27 ....170
i. 31 ....172
ii. 1 ....104
ii. 24 ....168
iii. 22 ....155
vi. 1–4 ....153, 154, 263
xvi. 7–12 ....144
xvi. 13 ....144
xviii. 14 ....121
xxi. 17–19 ....145
xxi. 33 ....122
xxii. 11–18 ....145
xxiv. ....36
xxxi. 11–13 ....145
xxxi. 42 ....112
xxxi. 53 ....112
xxxii. 20 ....311
xli. 38 ....157
xlviii. 15 f. ....145
xlix. 18 ....270

### Exodus.

iii. 2–6 ....145
iii. 14 ....100
iv. 16 ....85
iv. 24–26 ....58
vii. 1 ....85
xii. 8 ....51
xii. 21 ....145
xiv. 19 ....145
xiv. 24 f. ....145
xv. ....53, 93, 110, 120, 176, 281
xv. 11 ....24
xv. 13 ....117
xv. 17 f. ....281
xv. 18 ....122
xix. 6 ....44
xx.–xxiii. ....8, 36
xx. 2 f. ....24
xx. 5 ....199
xx. 11 ....127
xx. 24 f. ....41

PAGE
xxi. 6 ..... 112
xxii. 8 f. ..... 112
xxii. 28 ..... 112
xxiii. 19 ..... 52
xxxi. 12–17 ..... 284
xxxii. 4 ..... 29
xxxiii. 4 f. ..... 29
xxxiii. 14–16 ..... 143
xxxiii. 19 ..... 118, 119
xxxiv. ..... 8
xxxiv. 5 f. ..... 102, 118, 119
xxxiv. 11–26 ..... 36
xxxiv. 26 ..... 52

LEVITICUS.
i. – vii. ..... 308
xvi. ..... 288, 305
xvii. ..... 180
xvii. – xxvi. 5 ..... 177, 277, 280
xvii. 11 ..... 314, 315
xviii. – xx. ..... 277
xxiii. ..... 54
xxiii. 9 ff. ..... 52
xxiii. 9–14 ..... 50
xxiii. 10 ..... 54
xxiv. 16 ..... 249
xxvii. 28 ..... 68

NUMBERS.
iv. 25–27 ..... 144
vi. ..... 69
vi. 6 ff. ..... 69
viii. 5, 22 ..... 290
xii. 6–8 ..... 88, 89, 90
xv. 27–31 ..... 310
xxii. 22 ..... 258
xxii. 32 ..... 258
xxv. 19 ..... 115

DEUTERONOMY.
iv. 31 ..... 119
iv. 37 ..... 143
v. ..... 36, 128
vi. 15 ..... 110
vii. 9 ..... 102, 118
xv. 21 ..... 64
xvi. 9 ..... 50

PAGE
xviii. 15 ..... 220
xviii. 18 ..... 220
xx. 6 ..... 71
xxi. 9 ..... 181
xxi. 25 ..... 181
xxiii. 12 f. ..... 76
xxviii. 30 ..... 71
xxx. 15–20 ..... 131
xxxii. ..... 94, 102, 121
xxxii. 3 ..... 102
xxxii. 4 ..... 115
xxxii. 8 ..... 256
xxxii. 16 ..... 110
xxxii. 22 ff. ..... 110
xxxii. 43 ..... 311
xxxiii. 2 ..... 153
xxxiii. 8 ..... 18

JOSHUA.
v. 13–15 ..... 254

JUDGES.
ii. 1 ff. ..... 145
v. ..... 120, 176
v. 8 ..... 112
vi. 7 ff. ..... 11
vi. 11–16 ..... 145
vi. 20–24 ..... 145
vii. 13 f. ..... 17
ix. 9 ..... 155
ix. 13 ..... 155
ix. 23 ..... 158
xxi. 19 ff. ..... 55

1 SAMUEL.
ii. ..... 121
ii. 25 ..... 112
ii. 27 ff. ..... 11, 46
x. 5 ..... 14, 15
xv. 22 ..... 183, 184
xvii. 45 ..... 105
xix. 20 ff. ..... 14
xxiii. 9 ff. ..... 19
xxv. 37 ..... 162
xxviii. ..... 20
xxviii. 6 ..... 17
xxx. 7 f. ..... 19

2 Samuel.

PAGE

vi ....289
vii. 27–29....115
xv. 24....182
xxii. 11....147
xxiv. 1....260

1 Kings.

ii. 3....142
iii. 5 ff....17
viii. 4....182
xii. 16....220
xiii. 18....254
xxii. 19–23....257

2 Kings.

iii. 15....15
xiv. 6....242
xxi. 8....242
xxii. f....242
xxiii....180
xxiii. 9....286
xxiii. 21 ff....301

1 Chronicles.

xv....289
xxi. 1....259
xxi. 18....254

2 Chronicles.

v. 5....182
xii. 5–7....117
xxxv....301

Esther.

ix. 17–32....306

Job.

i.–ii....257, 258
iv. 18....153
xii. 10....161
xvi. 19–22....269
xix. 25–27....269
xxviii. 12 ff....251
xxviii. 23 ff....251
xxxiii. 23....153
xxxviii. 7....155

Psalms.

PAGE

viii....170, 171
xvi. 10 f....271
xviii....150
xviii. 10....147
xxi. 9....143
xxxii....191
xxxii. 11....191
xxxiii. 6....250
xlix. 15....271, 272
lxxiii. 24–26....272
lxxviii. 58 f....110
lxxxii. 6....112
lxxxix....115, 118
xci. 11....153
ciii. 20....153
civ. 29....159
cxlvii. 15....250
cxlviii. 2....153

Proverbs.

i.–ix....5
viii. 22 ff....125, 251
x. 1–xxii. 16....5
x. 7....270
xiv. 32....270
xv. 24....270
xvi. 6....312
xvi. 14....312
xxv.–xxix....5

Isaiah.

i.–xii....3
vi. 1–7....150
ix....221
ix. 6 f....223
ix. 7....220
xiii. 1–xiv. 23....4
xiv. 24–32....3
xv. 1–xvi. 12....3
xvii.–xx....3
xxi. 1–10....4
xxi. 11–xxii. 18....3
xxiv.–xxvii....4
xxvi. 19....273
xxviii.–xxxii....3
xxxiv. f....4
xxxvii. 21–35....4
xxxviii. 9–20....4

PAGE
xl.–lxvi. 4
xli. 8 ff. 226
xlii. 1–7. 226
xlii. 18 ff. 226
xliii. 1–10. 226
xliv. 1 f. 226
xliv. 21–26. 226
xlv. 4. 226
xlviii. 16. 250
xlviii. 20. 226
xlix. 1–9. 226
l. 4–10. 226
lii. 13–15. 230
lii. 13–liii. 12. 226, 230
liii. 227, 232, 236
liii. 7. 230
lv. 11. 250
lxiii. 10. 250
lxv. 8–10. 231

JEREMIAH.
vi. 27. 86
vii. 22 f. 184
xxxiii. 6. 225
xxxiii. 18. 181
xxxiii. 21 f. 181
l.–li. 4

LAMENTATIONS.
iv. 16. 143

EZEKIEL.
i. 148
iii. 17. 86
x. 148
xxv. 14. 111
xxv. 17. 111
xxxiii. 7. 86
xxxviii. 18–23. 109
xlv. 25. 56

DANIEL.
ii. 334
vii. 336
vii. 25. 338
viii. 339
ix. 341
ix. 25. 342
ix. 26. 342

PAGE
x. 332
xi. 332
xii. 2 f. 272
xii. 7. 338

HOSEA.
ii. 19. 118
iii. 5. 222
viii. 12. 242
xii. 9. 55

MICAH.
v. 221
v. 7–9. 213
v. 9. 213

NAHUM.
i. 2. 111

ZECHARIAH.
i.–viii. 4
iii. 1. 259
iv. 9. 221
ix.–xi. 3
ix. 221
ix. 9. 222
ix. 9 f. 220
xii.–xiv. 4, 220
xii. 8. 145, 225
xiv. 16–19. 56

1 MACCABEES.
iii. 49. 69

2 MACCABEES.
ii. 13. 245
iv. 34. 342
vii. 28. 126

SIRACH.
xliv.–xlix. 245

WISDOM.
ii. 23 f. 262

ACTS.
xxi. 23 f. 69

1 CORINTHIANS.
xiv. 90

## IV. HEBREW TERMS.

*acharith-hayyamim* (*the latter days*), 202.
*Adhon* (*Lord*), 114.
*Adhonay* (*my Lord*), 114, 249.
*asham* (*be guilty*), 197.
*Attah-El-roï* (*Thou God seest me*), 145.
*Azazel*, 261.

*bene-Elohim* (*sons of God*), 155.

*chayyah* (*living*), 160.
*chesedh* (*grace*), 117.

*ehyeh* (*I am*), 100.
*El* (*God*), 113, 120.
*elilim* (*worthless*), 95.
*Elohim* (*God*), 103, 111 f., 155, 249.
*elyon* (*highest*), 113.

*hawah*, *hayah* (*be*), 100.

*kaphar* (*cover*), 311.
*kasah* (*cover*), 312.

*lebh*, *lebhabh* (*heart*), 162.

*malakh* (*angel*), 144 f., 153 f., 258.
*minchah* (*gift*), 61.

*nabhi* (*prophet*), 83.
*nazir* (*consecrated*), 69.
*nephesh* (*soul*), 160 f., 165, 167.
*neshamah* (*breath*), 162.

*olam* (*eternity*), 122.

*pesach* (*passover*), 51.

*qadhesh* (*be holy*), 108.
*qadhosh* (*holy*), 69, 106.
*qorban* (*gift*), 61, 316.

*ruach* (*spirit*), 161, 167, 257.

*satan* (*adversary*), 258.
*saraph* (*seraph*), 151.
*ṣebhaoth* (*hosts*), 103 ff.
*seïrim* (*satyrs*), 261.
*shadday* (*almighty*), 113, 120.
*shedhim* (*demons*), 261.
*sheol* (*Hades*), 266 f.
*ṣidheqoth* (*righteous deeds*), 117.

*torah* (*instruction*), 241.

*Yahweh* (*Jehovah*), 100, 249 f.

# LIBRARY OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICS.

MESSRS. T. Y. CROWELL & CO. take pleasure in announcing that they have completed arrangements for a series of volumes dealing with timely topics in a fresh, interesting, and instructive manner. The series will be entitled "Library of Economics and Politics," and will be under the editorial control of Professor Richard T. Ely, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Political Economy and Director of the School of Economics, Political Science and History at the University of Wisconsin.

It is proposed to issue volumes at irregular intervals, and to supply only the best literature. A standard of excellence will be maintained, which it is hoped will give to this series a leading rank in this country and abroad.

The volumes for which arrangements have thus far been made are: —

*First*, "THE INDEPENDENT TREASURY SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES." An historical and critical examination of this important institution; a work which will prove valuable to bankers and financiers generally, as well as to scholars. The author of this volume is Mr. DAVID KINLEY, A.B., Assistant and Fellow in Economics in the University of Wisconsin.

*Second*, "AMERICAN CHARITIES: A STUDY IN PHILANTHROPY AND ECONOMICS." By AMOS G. WARNER, Ph.D., Superintendent of Charities for the District of Columbia, and Professor-elect of Economics in the Leland-Stanford, Jr. University. This work will be the first exhaustive treatment of the subject. It will be a careful presentation of theory and of practical experience, making it an indispensable hand-book for all those who are theoretically and practically interested in charities.

*Third*, "REPUDIATION OF STATE DEBTS IN THE UNITED STATES." By WILLIAM A. SCOTT, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Political Economy in the University of Wisconsin. This is a work which deals with one of the most important phases of American finance. Perhaps there is no field of financial investigation in the United States which has been so neglected. The work will be of practical importance to all those who are concerned with investments, as well as to scholars interested in our financial history and institutions.

The editor of the series promises two volumes. One on Socialism, which will be considered descriptively and critically. The work will be divided into four parts: Part One treating of the Nature of Socialism, Part Two of the Strength of Socialism, Part Three of the Weakness of Socialism, and Part Four, the Golden Mean, or Practicable Social Reform. The other volume which the editor will contribute, will be called "Suggestions on Social Topics," dealing with social classes, legal inequality, labor organizations, the eight-hour day, the widening and deepening range of ethical obligation, etc.

ALBERT SHAW, Ph.D., American Editor of the "Review of Reviews," is engaged in the preparation of a work suitable for the series, the title of which will be announced subsequently. The publishers, however, venture to assure the public that the work by Dr. SHAW will be one of the most popular and useful volumes in the series.

**THOMAS Y. CROWELL & CO., NEW YORK and BOSTON.**

# IMPORTANT HISTORICAL WORKS.

## THE FOUNDING OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE.

Based chiefly upon Prussian State Documents, by HEINRICH VON SYBEL. Translated by Marshall Livingston Perrin, assisted by Gamaliel Bradford, Jr. Completed in 5 vols. Cloth, per set, $10.00; half mor., $20.00.

"No more important historical work has appeared in the last decade." — *Nation.*
"Impossible to praise too highly." — *Chicago Standard.*
"A triumph of historical description."—*Detroit Free Press.*

## A HISTORY OF FRANCE.

By VICTOR DURUY, member of the French Academy. Abridged and translated from the seventeenth French edition, by Mrs. M. Carey, with an introductory notice and a continuation to the year 1890, by J. Franklin Jameson, Ph.D., Professor of History in Brown University. With 12 engraved colored maps. In one volume. 12mo. Cloth, $2.00. Half calf, $4.00.

"Of all the short summaries of French History, this is probably the best." — *Ex-President Andrew D. White, Cornell University.*

A book widely desired by schools, colleges and libraries, students and general readers.

## MEMOIRS OF NAPOLEON BONAPARTE.

By LOUIS ANTOINE FAUVELET DE BOURRIENNE, his Private Secretary. Edited by Col. R. W. Phipps. New and revised edition, with 34 full-page portraits and other illustrations. 4 vols. 12mo. Cloth, plain, $5.00. Cloth, gilt top, paper label, $6.00. Half calf, $12.00. Limited edition with over 100 illustrations, gilt top, half leather, $10.00. The latest American edition, and the only one with a complete index.

"If you want something to read both interesting and amusing, get the 'Memoires de Bourrienne.' These are the only authentic memoirs of Napoleon which have as yet appeared." — *Prince Metternich.*

## RECOLLECTIONS OF A PRIVATE.

A Story of the Army of the Potomac. By WARREN LEE GOSS, author of "Jed." With over 80 illustrations by Chapin and Shelton. Royal 8vo., cloth, $3.00. Seal russia, $4.00. Half morocco, $5.00.

"No volume of war history has given the reader more graphic descriptions of army life." — *Inter Ocean.*
"One of the handsomest as well as one of the most valuable works in American war literature." — *Boston Globe.*

## HER MAJESTY'S TOWER.

By W. HEPWORTH DIXON. New edition, complete in one volume. A history of the Tower of London, from the seventh London edition, with 47 illustrations. Royal 12mo. Cloth, $2.00. Half calf, $4.00. The result of twenty years' research.

"The best possible introduction a stranger can have to that famous building." — *Christian Union.*

## THE NARRATIVE OF CAPTAIN COIGNET, SOLDIER OF THE EMPIRE, 1776-1850.

An autobiographical account of one of Napoleon's Body-Guard. Fully illustrated. 12mo., half leather, $2.50. Half calf, $5.00.

"It is meagre praise to say that it is interesting. It is more than that. It is a panorama." — *Minneapolis Journal.*
"As direct as Robinson Crusoe, vived almost beyond expression." — *Boston Herald.*

---

*For sale by all Booksellers. Catalogues sent free upon application*

---

**T. Y. CROWELL & CO., New York & Boston.**

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: June 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

BS171

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 327 415 9